





Thomas Holden.

Spring Field.

Bolton.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

MEMOIRS AND CORRESPONDENCE

OF

MALLET DU PAN.

—

VOL. I.

MEMOIRS
AND CORRESPONDENCE
OF
M ALLET DU PAN,
ILLUSTRATIVE
OF THE
HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

COLLECTED AND ARRANGED
BY A. SAYOUS,
LATE PROFESSOR AT THE ACADEMY OF GENEVA.

IN TWO VOLUMES.
VOL. I.

LONDON:
RICHARD BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET.
Publisher in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

M. DCCC. LIII.

LONDON :

Printed by Schulze and Co., 13, Poland Street.

TO
M. LE COMTE PORTALIS,

FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE COURT OF CASSATION, MEMBER OF THE ACADEMIE
DES SCIENCES, MORALES ET POLITIQUES, ETC.

My dear Portalis,

On the 22nd December, 1800, the year of my father's death, you wrote to me from Frankfort: "My regret for the death of your father will last as long as my life. Neither I, nor my father, ever failed, whether in France or elsewhere, to express the feelings of esteem and deep attachment, I may even say of veneration, with which he had inspired us." Since then more than half a century has elapsed: we have been almost constantly separated: revolutions, war, great political movements, have more than once changed the face of Europe. You have been called, under the successive governments of France, to distinguished posts in the administration and the magistracy, in which you have gained an eminent reputation; but, thanks to the constancy of your friendship, the

sentiments which united us in 1798, in our exile at Brisgau, have never changed.

I claim, therefore, with confidence, your interest for this work, in which you will recognize, in all the integrity of his character and opinions, the man whom you loved and esteemed.

I wish also to avail myself of this call upon your friendship, to afford some explanation of the delay which has taken place in the publication of these papers; for, although they possess perhaps, at the present moment, an adventitious interest in virtue of the great political, economic, and social questions raised by the events of 1848, the value which appears to me to belong to them, whether as historical documents, or as *Memoirs* of one of the most eminent public writers of his epoch, would, at any time, have warranted their publication.

Nor have I ever overlooked the duties and the responsibility imposed on me by the possession of so precious a relic as my father's Correspondence, and have never ceased hoping, with all the strength of the affection and respect I bear his memory, to be able to do justice to his sentiments and opinions: but various obstacles have interposed. In the first place, it would have been scarcely becoming to render public, and consequently expose to criticism, during the life of many distinguished political personages, that part of the correspondence which relates to them. Since their death—independently of my inaptitude, after fifty years' naturalization in England, to

undertake a literary work in a language no longer familiar to me—I have lost a sister, married at Geneva, Madame Colladon, who had lived constantly with her family from 1789 to 1796, and who, possessed of a highly retentive memory, and deeply impressed with the merits of her father, and with the vicissitudes of his stormy career, and endowed in a remarkable degree with the talent of expressing her thoughts and reminiscences interestingly and with eloquence, would have been of inestimable service to me in the accomplishment of this pious task, had I, in spite of other difficulties which it would have been necessary to overcome, resolved on undertaking it.

I had no alternative, under such circumstances, but that of confiding to other hands a task in which I could no longer engage. A fellow-countryman, a friend of my family, came to my aid.

He would not allow me to say here what I think of his labours ; but I can at least assure you that, if you estimate them as I do, he will feel honoured by your approbation, which will afford me also the most sensible pleasure.

J. L. MALLET.

HAMPSHIRE, AUGUST 1. 1851

P R E F A C E.

FIFTY years ago, these *Memoirs* would have had no need of the explanation they require at present. The writer whose career they retrace, had then lately died in the enjoyment of the most honourable repute: his name was European; his writings, translated into many languages, were spread far and wide. No one connected with the political world was unaware that this writer, a republican as well from conviction as by origin, had deserved the confidence of Louis XVI. in the King's last dangers, and that his counsels had been received in the great cabinets of Europe. All his prophecies, met by incredulity in the first instance, had been realised one after the other; and something of the respect paid to prophetic minds attached to his then recent memory.

But this reputation was intimately connected with the revolution: it paled, like so many others, when the great successes of Bonaparte prevailed in the popular imagination over recollections of the revolution itself. The journals, the pamphlets of those fatal times, and the names of their authors, merged rapidly into oblivion.

When, after a lapse of twenty years, under the restored

monarchy of the Bourbons, a new generation re-opened these records with an eager curiosity for searching in them the living history of an epoch, yet recent, but, as it were already distant and well-nigh mysterious to it, every testimony was not consulted with the same eagerness. The most neglected, as was natural, were those which might have cast an unwelcome shadow over an event in which the liberal enthusiasm of the French youth desired to behold the misunderstood work of the genius of modern liberty, and which appeared to it not less poetic in all its details than sublime in its general result. The language of the revolutionary writings was listened to with curiosity, perhaps with indulgence: the men who had had the misfortune of being reasonable were left in their obscurity and their silence. It is thus that Mallet du Pan, the friend of a Mounier, of a Malouet, was no more consulted or quoted, than if he had not stood face to face with the uncurbed spirit of revolution, as a courageous organ of that considerable section of public opinion which maintained that the happiness and the liberty of France required to be founded on the equally guaranteed rights of the people and the sovereign.

Now that an unforeseen revolution has dissipated the blessed dream which offered to the friends of liberty the ideal of 1789 realised on earth, and the era of political convulsions closed for a length of time, a juster disposition is shown towards the maxims and the views of the monarchical and constitutional party of the first Assembly; and the moment seems arrived for the writers who maintained and defended it, to present to the ordeal of philosophy and history their testimony and their conclusions. Consider

ing the prolonged succession of that multitude of historical and political writings in which the French Revolution is by turns attacked and defended, it would be difficult to deny a general disposition to re-open the question of the merit of the terrible work—to suffer the problem to be at last elucidated by all the lights of history and discussion. If, on the one hand, generous spirits seem more than ever convinced that the Assembly, the revolutionary issue of the States-General, gave a final solution to philosophy, and perhaps to religion, it is confidently demanded, on the other, whether faith in the absolute mission of the revolution is sufficiently well-grounded; and, without pronouncing sentence, the majority of thinking men agree in the opinion that affairs are in a sufficiently bad case to make it worth while to re-consider a dogma which weighs on modern politics as the authority of Aristotle did aforetime upon science.

There was reason to hope, therefore, that a work in which the close of the last century is observed and judged by a highly sagacious historian, in which the great question is proposed and discussed by a political thinker of no common order, would be received with interest. Not only has this hope dissipated the hesitation which had hitherto prevented the publication of the papers and correspondence of Mallet du Pan, but it has suggested the idea of including in this impression various fragments of the writings, and especially of the political journals, which, whether during or previously to the revolution, laid the foundation of the writer's fame, and are now either rare or forgotten.

The somewhat unusual framework of these *Mémoires*

will therefore present at once the life of Mallet du Pan, and the essence of his labours as a writer. This mixture of narrative and of extensive quotation is somewhat novel in French literature; but the method has in its favour the sometimes happy application which it has received in English biographies; it is specially suited for making known those political writers whose productions, always occasional, can now possess but a partial interest, and which require, in order that they may be reperused with pleasure and profit, to be replaced in their date and historical point of view.

The attractive story of an adventurous life will not be looked for in this work—not that the personal career of Mallet du Pan is devoid of interest, but this interest belongs to the times and events in which he moved. The value of Mallet, as well as his peculiar merit, is that of having seen closely—of having depicted and judged in his writings, the entire political movement of the last century, whether he observed the scene simply as a bystander, or whether, consulted by the great personages of the drama, he stated his views and offered his advice, and that of having always borne himself as in the presence of history, merging his life, so to speak, in the cause of the principles of justice and of reason engaged in those terrible contests.

It is natural that the Memoirs which retrace such a career should offer almost exclusively, in conjunction with the impressions and the thoughts of the man, a vivid picture of the persons and the things which occasioned them. Such are in fact, in great part, the following Memoirs, as the history of the French Revolution reflected, as it were, from the opening of the States-General to the

days of the Consulate, which Mallet was still spared to witness and to judge. The materials of which the Memoirs are composed have been chosen—irrespectively of the journals and writings published by Mallet du Pan—first, of a Miscellany or sort of private journal in which Mallet, since his arrival in Paris, noted down his historical observations ; secondly, of a body of Memoirs or political advices which had been asked of the writer by several sovereigns, by the French Princes themselves, and also by various statesmen for their personal information ; lastly, of the still considerable remains of a fertile correspondence, maintained by Mallet du Pan with his friends Malouet, de Pradt, Montlosier, Lally-Tolendal, Portalis, Sainte-Aldegonde, the Chevalier de Gallatin, M. de Hardenberg, and many other distinguished men.

As far as possible, the purely conjectural discussions which naturally abound in many of these pages have been omitted ; but whatever partook of the nature of historic critique and philosophic judgment, whatever could serve to define the manner in which events were felt by contemporaries, has been, and deserved to be, retained : we hope that it will be so considered. In one word, we have desired to produce an useful work, and we have been on our guard against allowing it to be in any sense a work of vanity, confident of thus honouring, with a respect which he would have accepted, the least vain of men, and most practical of thinkers.

Nevertheless, the titles of pamphleteer and of historian are not the only ones it is our object to recall. There are aspects in the merit of Mallet du Pan, not the less valuable for belonging to his character and perhaps to

his education. We have attempted to develop a programme of the kind thus traced many years since by a pious hand : "That which appears to me the most interesting to be enforced in the record of my father's life," said the daughter of Mallet du Pan, "is the moral character of his mind—that independence of opinion which raised up against him so many enemies, and which so many men of various parties sought so often and so vainly to warp for their own purposes ; the courage with which during the years of the revolution he braved the threats, the imprecations, the writings, whether avowed or anonymous, of the enemies of the good cause. I have seen revolutionists come to him, to force him to retract some article in his journal, menacing him with their vengeance ; and my father has answered them with a firmness full of moderation and dignity, that he might be assassinated, but would never be induced to disavow his principles. A Protestant, he defended the Catholic clergy with all his talent, and with the warmth which animated his writings ; a republican, he defended the threatened monarchies ; because these were the causes of order and of morality. Menaced on all sides, harrassed by the fears of his friends and family, he remained ever unshaken, and ready to answer with his head for the cause he defended ; of uncertain health, he uniformly displayed unbending intrepidity ; with the most limited fortune, he showed the most noble disinterestedness ; and the elevation of his character is no less remarkable than his talents. Persons from the provinces, men of all ranks, came to thank him for the services rendered by him to the public cause and to themselves personally ; he was implored to continue his

perilous task, and was overwhelmed with praises which failed to excite his vanity."

The daughter of the pamphleteer, had she known the communications addressed by her father to the governments of the Coalition, would have added, that the policy which he recommended to the statesmen of the empire, of Prussia, and of Great Britain, was a moral policy as elevated as the circumstances were momentous. If he was among the first to understand that it was no longer a question of military tactics *à la* Frederick II. in view of the daring of generals and the frenzied impetuosity of revolutionary masses, he felt yet more acutely that the French republicans would have the better of the powers if the latter would not forget their old policy of the balance of power and jealousy, to unite in a war of principles, and, above all, of justice. All the under-current of conquest in regard to France by the union of the allied States, appeared to him an iniquity of ill omen—an immense blunder—and this he declared with a sense of eloquent conviction.

It will be for the reader to decide whether Mallet du Pan deserved, in fact, the place which we claim for him among the enlightened observers and judges of the close of the last century. But one merit will not be denied him after the perusal of these *Memoirs*—that of having always combined in a high degree, during his career as a writer, integrity of character with superiority of mind.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

CHAPTER I.

1749—1773.

Céligny—Mallet du Pan; his family—His studies at the College, and at the Academy of Geneva—Revolutions of Geneva in the eighteenth century—Mallet adopts the defence of the *natives*—His first political treatise—Friendship with Voltaire—The young Professor of History at Cassel—Inaugural Discourse: “What is the influence of Philosophy on the Belles-Lettres?”—Letter from Voltaire—Mallet du Pan returns to Geneva . . . 1

CHAPTER II.

1773—1784.

Historical and political studies—Linguet—Mallet undertakes his defence, and contributes to his “*Annales politiques et littéraires*”—Letter from Voltaire to Mallet du Pan—Linguet at the Bastille—Mallet edits the continuation of the “*Annales*”—Character of the work—Acts of the American insurgents—Critical condition of Great Britain—The Abbé Raynal—Mallet attacked in reference to Voltaire—His reply—Anecdotes—Letter from Vagnères . . . 24

CHAPTER III.

1781—1782.

Fresh disturbances at Geneva—The “*Idées soumises par un médiateur sans conséquence*”—The Genevese Revolution of 1782; its analogy to the French Revolution—Geneva invested by the troops of Berne, France and Savoy—Excitement of the people—Mallet sent on a mission to M. de la Marmora—The city opens its gates—Account of these events in the “*Mémoires politiques*”—Brissot at Geneva 58

CHAPTER IV.

1784—1789.

Mallet du Pan quits Geneva and goes to Paris—The “*Mercur de France*”—M. Panckoucke intrusts to Mallet the political part of the “*Mercur*”—Revolution in Holland, and contention between Mallet and the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Mirabeau: “*Analyse des papiers anglais*”—News from England—Trial of Warren Hastings—Rage of Mirabeau and Brissot 82

CHAPTER V.

1784—1789.

Articles of Mallet in the literary department of the “*Mercur*”—Montesquieu on Republics—Grotius and the law of nations—Ideas upon political economy—Learning and manners at the close of the eighteenth century—Life of Mallet in Paris—Panckoucke’s household—Bulwer—Anecdote 111

CHAPTER VI.

1785—1787.

Private Journal of Mallet du Pan—Historical and moral observations concerning Paris from 1785 to 1789 . . . 130

CHAPTER VII.

1789—1792.

Articles upon the English Constitution published in the “*Mercure de France*” before the meeting of the States General—Opinions of Mallet du Pan upon the first acts of the Constituent Assembly—Position and character of the “*Mercure*” after the suppression of the censorship . . . 161

CHAPTER VIII.

1789—1790.

Opinions of Mallet in the “*Mercure de France*” from 1789 to 1792—Declaration of the rights of man—Scenes at Versailles (October 5th and 6th)—Flight of Mounier; retirement of Lally-Tollendal—Mallet du Pan threatened—His relations with Malouet become more intimate—Injustice of the majority—Declamations on the right—Civic oath—Provisional law on the liberty of the press 179

CHAPTER IX.

1790.

Mallet du Pan's journey to Geneva—Return to Paris—Selfishness of the Constituent Assembly—Denunciation of a libel against M. de la Fayette—Article, in the “*Mercure*,” on the year 1789—Duel

between Cazalès and Barnave—Opinion on M. Necker—The Editor of the “*Mercur*” summoned by a deputation of citizens to write in favour of the Revolution—His declaration—He raises his voice in favour of the shamefully ill-treated Catholic clergy—Mirabeau ; his death—Particulars extracted from the notes of Mallet du Pan on the connection between Mirabeau and the Court 201

CHAPTER X.

1791.

Flight from Varennes—Domiciliary visit to Mallet du Pan—On the origin of factions—The King visits the Assembly to sanction the Constitutional Act—Opinion of the “*Mercur*” on the Constituent Assembly 238

CHAPTER XI.

1791—1792.

The Legislative Assembly—The “*Mercur*” declares against war—Political condition of Europe—Uneasiness of the minority of the Assembly—Secret intrigues against the Jacobins—Committees : projects for saving the King—Private notes of Mallet du Pan—Decrees of the Assembly relative to the assassins of Avignon, the colonies, and the emigrants—The Brissot ministry—Mallet’s final articles in the “*Mercur de France*” 249

CHAPTER XII.

1792.

Louis XVI. entrusts to Mallet du Pan a political mission to the Emperor and the King of Prussia—Nature of the instructions given by the King to his agent—Departure of Mallet for Geneva.

and thence for Frankfort—Coblentz—M. de Montlosier, and the Chevalier de Panat—The Princes are dissatisfied with the mission of Mallet—Occurrences of the 20th June—Letters of Malouet and the Abbé de Pradt—Conferences at Frankfort—Note from Louis XVI.—Opposition of the Russian minister, M. de Romanzoff—Tardy success of Mallet with the ministers of Russia and Austria—The manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick—Error of Bertrand de Moleville in his “Memoirs.” 288

CHAPTER XIII.

1792—1793.

Return to Geneva—General Montesquiou invades Savoy—Preparation for defence—The allied cantons send troops—Clavière—Generous conduct of Montesquiou—Mallet du Pan retires to Lausanne—Baron d'Erlach—Letter of Count Joseph de Maistre to Mallet du Pan—Death of Louis XVI.—Memoir addressed by Mallet du Pan to the Kings of Prussia and Sardinia . 341

CHAPTER XIV.

1793.

Letter of Maréchal de Castries—Mallet du Pan goes to Brussels—The Arch-Duke Charles, Lord Elgin, Sir J. Macpherson—Proceedings of Dumouriez—Mallet publishes the “*Considérations sur la Révolution française*”—Indignation of the *émigrés*—Letter of Montlosier—Letter to Maréchal de Castries 365

CHAPTER XV.

1793.

Insurrections in the interior of France—Imprudent policy of the Governments of the Coalition regarding the insurgent departments and the Swiss Cantons—Representations on this subject addressed by Mallet to Lord Grenville 390

CHAPTER XVI.

1794.

Historical and political report drawn up for Lord Elgin—On the character of the French Revolution and its successive aspects—The means employed to oppose it—Its military and financial resources—State of public opinion in France—Debates in the English Parliament	405
---	-----

CONFIRMATORY DOCUMENTS AND APPENDIX.

I. Extract from the “ <i>Mercure</i> ” on the theatres of Paris	434
II. Memorial presented by Mallet du Pan to the Allied Powers on the part of Louis XVI.	439
III. Letter from Colonel Thouvenot to Mallet du Pan	461
IV. Letter from General Montesquiou to D’Ivernois.	464
Letter from the Duke of Orleans (Louis Philippe) to the same	469

MEMOIRS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF MALLET DU PAN.

CHAPTER I.

1749—1773.

Céligny—Mallet du Pan; his family—His studies at the College, and at the Academy of Geneva—Revolutions of Geneva in the eighteenth century—Mallet adopts the defence of the *natives*—His first political treatise—Friendship with Voltaire—The young Professor of History at Cassel—Inaugural Discourse: “What is the influence of Philosophy on the Belles-Lettres?”—Letter from Voltaire—Mallet du Pan returns to Geneva.

JACQUES MALLET DU PAN was born in 1749, in the presbytery of Céligny, one of those lovely villages which crown the right bank of the Lake of Geneva. Planted with noble trees, traversed by abundant waters descending from the Jura, commanding by its position Lake Lemman and the Savoyard Alps, Céligny, like Genthod and Coppet which adjoin it, is one of those charming places in which the imagination would more willingly place the cradle of a poet than that of a *savant*, a philosopher, or a politician. The fine trees of Genthod shaded Charles Bonnet, the wise

Abauzit, and the youth of Saussure; Coppet, which had harboured the sceptic Bayle, sheltered the retreat of Necker. These seeming mistakes of fate are not to be smiled at. Who would assert that poetical sentiment was deficient in Bonnet, de Saussure, or the amiable Abauzit? A familiarity with the beauties of nature enlarges the mental perception; and patriotism to the inhabitant of towns is quite a different sentiment from that which influences the man who has passed the season of lively impressions in presence of the great scenes of nature.

In the midst of the severe conflicts which occupied his life, Mallet du Pan often gives expression to that kind of emotion to which the remembrance of a beautiful native country can alone open the heart. He passed his childhood at Céligny with his father. The latter, the pastor of this Genevese village, included in the Pays de Vaud and bordering on France, was much beloved there. He was a man of sound sense, of gentle character and agreeable manners, and not deficient in a certain amount of talent as a preacher. The Genevese clergy was mostly recruited from the ranks of the aristocracy; the Pastor Mallet occupied therefore in the country a social position, which was further elevated by his marriage with Mademoiselle du Pan, the daughter of a syndic, and belonging to one of the most ancient families of the magistracy. There still reigned in the Republic, and particularly among its chiefs, that extreme simplicity of manners, which the Reformation and the austere institutions of Calvin had established and maintained in the Protestant city.*

* The family of Mallet were fond of relating an anecdote of which the great grandfather of our journalist was the hero. An envoy

In accordance with the republican usage universal among Genevese families of all ranks, Mallet commenced his studies at the College of Geneva, founded by Calvin, and at that time occupied by distinguished professors. His precocious superiority always secured to him the highest prizes of his class. At the age of fifteen he entered the *Auditoires*,* simultaneously with Clavière, afterwards Minister of Finance to the Convention, and with two other individuals destined to take an active part in the revolutions of Geneva—the Syndic Dentand and the Minister Gasc. Among the Professors of Philosophy, Mallet was fortunate in finding Bertrand, a worthy disciple of the great Euler, and de Saussure, the youthful successor of his illustrious uncle Bonnet, in the academic chair. Having completed his course of philosophy, Mallet for a time studied the law, but his ardent mind was already occupied with far other objects: his ideas—luxuriant, indeed, but as yet ill defined—found vent in attempts at literary composition, in which were united some thought, much vehemence, some obscurity and but little taste: they were the raw productions of a school-boy. But scarcely had he emerged from the Academy at the age of twenty, when he commenced his career as a politician and journalist, by conduct and writings

from the Court of France presenting himself to the first syndic to make his ceremonial visit, found the worthy magistrate seated at his kitchen hearth on his return from the Council, and watching with interest the manufacture of *brisselets* (a kind of domestic pastry). The fireplace was capacious: the republican statesman cordially invited the Ambassador to be seated, and partake of his collation, a *naïve* piece of politeness which was graciously accepted by the representative of Louis XIV.

* A name given at Geneva to the Academy.

of which we can comprehend neither the nature nor the tendency unless we call to mind the political agitations which convulsed Geneva during the eighteenth century. These revolutionary troubles, now but imperfectly remembered even by the Genevese, are banished by us to an obscure place in history ; yet in their day they commanded the attention of all Europe ; and excited an amount of interest disproportioned indeed to the narrow theatre where they were enacted, but not to the wishes and presentiments of their age.

Perhaps undue honour has been accorded to the policy of this small Republic, when it has been regarded as the mother of the republican liberty of our times : reason and social science played a less brilliant part than has been believed in the interminable discussions of this litigious nation. But the two greatest names of the eighteenth century, the names of Voltaire and Rousseau are connected with them ; and it must be admitted that more than one distinguished writer issued from this school. Only to speak of those who have left important works, the advocate De Lolme, the annalist of the English Constitution ; M. Necker, Mallet du Pan, D'Ivernois, Dumont, the expounder of Bentham—these had all learned directly from the revolutions of Geneva what illusions the wisest men are liable to mistake for the true conditions of freedom. We may be allowed, then, to take a retrospective view of the political annals of Geneva, and to seek in them the explanation of the events which involved Mallet du Pan, at so early an age, in the fierce contests of politics.

Had not a Pope, who was Duke of Savoy, and who had observed the Genevese closely, complained as far

back as the fifteenth century of the discontented character of that small nation, one might be tempted to account for the restless spirit which has harassed it at so many periods of its history, from the mode in which it has been recruited since the Reformation. The refugees of all countries who arrived within its walls had preferred quitting their native land to changing their opinions: arguing with fervour on behalf of their creeds, all had become more or less filled with a jealous feeling of their rights. But whatever be its origin, this character for debate found occasion for its exercise, even after the great struggles of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, in the midst of the theological disputations which, during the seventeenth, shook the ancient authority of St. Augustin, and ended by substituting for calvanistic orthodoxy in Geneva itself, a rationalism essentially opposed to it.

On the accomplishment of this revolution, and the exhaustion of theologic acrimony, the restlessness of the Genevese spirit took another direction. All at once it made the discovery of what it might have known for a century—that the administration circulated in a certain number of families, which reigned indeed without pomp or harshness, preserving with traditional reverence the ancient religious and republican austerity infused into the habits of the country by the efforts of Calvin. Long as this aristocratic *régime* had been established, the first who opened his eyes to its abuses, fancied that he woke from a long sleep, and attempted to oppose new laws as a barrier to the ambition of the aristocracy: and the feeling of the people seconded his own. The abuses whose redress

was demanded were redressed ; precautions were adopted against the exclusiveness of the aristocracy ; but the spirit that had dictated these complaints was insatiable, for it was the restless genius of modern democracy, which, in this confined corner of the world, was already arising in its strength and ready to respond to concessions by inexhaustible exactions. It was not yet foreseen, that, marching from stage to stage, from generation to generation—carried forward towards an undefinable goal by the generous desires of sincere hearts as much as by the violent impulsion of the base—aided by the reason of the wise as by the error of the inconsiderate, it could not repose even after victory. Whether through pride, or the instinct of self-preservation, the Genevese aristocracy, offended at this sudden alarm, and thus rendered more jealous of privileges legitimatized in its eyes by the sanction of time, and by the gentle and conscientious manner in which they were asserted, endeavoured to quell these discontented feelings, and take vengeance by punishing their instigators. The aristocracy for the first time showed themselves violent and indiscreet, and imprudently began to deserve the mistrust of which they complained : they ordered the arrest of a member of their own body, who, after taking the initiative in remonstrances, had announced others, and caused him to be shot in the prison-court.

From that moment there was disunion in this little community into which discord should never have intruded. There was no end to the mutual watching and contention of parties, and of the attempt on the one hand to maintain, on the other to change, their position. It would be long and tedious to relate by what legislative

processes—or rather perhaps by what intrigues—each party sought to gain its end. The right of applying a negative (a species of legislative veto opposed by the magistrates to the motions of the citizens), obstinately asserted by the Government, passionately contested by the citizens, was a political bugbear which prevented a perception of the true constitutional remedies applicable to the troubles of the Republic. An exposition of it here would neither interest nor enlighten: it will be enough to state that this right gave the name of *negatives* to the partisans of the aristocracy, whilst their adversaries (who would more recently have been called liberals), who expressed their demands through the medium of representation, adopted the title of *representatives*.*

A pamphlet mania took possession of the excited townsmen; and the irritation of the wrangling, passing from the writings into the hearts of the writers, burst out at times in open violence. Blood flowed, and it was found necessary to have recourse to the Swiss Cantons and even to France (a dangerous expedient) in order to pacify the republicans, who had become incapable of preserving themselves from the peril of civil war. In 1738 especially, the allies had terminated the conflict by a sort of arbitration, which procured for the Republic a repose of some years' duration. But the treatise of Rousseau, "*L'Inégalité des*

* These party names eventually became familiar, even to strangers. Voltaire gave celebrity to them by frequent allusions. In his tale, "*L'Homme aux quarante écus*," he says, to give an idea of the miracle-working gaiety of M. André: "Il aurait fait, souper gaie-ment ensemble un Corse et un Génois, un *représentant* de Genève et un *négatif*, un muéti et un archevêque."

conditions," and his "*Contrat social*," although an idealized sketch from the system of the Genevese Constitution, contribute to reanimate the fanaticism of political discontent: the dogma of popular sovereignty inflamed men's minds, and the representatives of the *bourgeoisie*, with redoubled exigency, seized every opportunity of provoking the aristocracy, and of stripping it for their own profit of its political advantages. Whatever resistance or movement the provoked Senate attempted, to deliver itself from these ever more galling aggressions, excited the clamour of its adversaries, who were conscientious in their mistrust, and played their part of victims in all sincerity. Moreover, the indiscreet tone of the agents of France, now mixed up with the affairs of Geneva, served for a pretext; and great was the exultation of republican pride, when one of the representatives asked the Chevalier de Bouteville to his face, when the latter spoke of his master's wishes: "Is your King our's?"

When the Senate, thinking to make a show of justice and of firmness in imitation of the *parlement* of Paris, committed the double blunder of burning "*Emile*" before the Hôtel-de-Ville by the hands of the hangman, and of proscribing the person of its author, the indignation of the party did not miss so fair an opportunity of bursting forth into threats. For a moment opinion was suspended by an able treatise of the Procureur-Général Tronchin, who, discussing calmly and with moderation the sentence simultaneously pronounced against the "*Emile*" and Rousseau, presented the political constitution of the country in an aspect calculated to recal the affection of the Genevese, who piqued themselves on living under a

system so republican, free, and honest. The readers of these earnest and sensible words could not but recollect themselves: "A free people should be vigilant, and rely on none but itself for the defence of its liberty; but that restless alarm which frightens itself with its own cries is not vigilance." The conclusion of the "*Lettres écrites de la campagne*" is also remarkable.

"Why this perturbation amid an administration framed to inspire confidence? Be not astonished, Sir; liberty has its storms; these are tributes which must be paid to it, and paid with as little distaste as need be. The same objects are viewed very differently; and I have always remarked that the most strong and elevated minds, devoted to the interests of liberty, seldom regard authority without some uneasiness. Their eyes, opened to its disadvantages, are closed more or less to its necessity. But with a thinking people errors cannot last very long: men return to that medium which is attained but slowly in matters of government; and, after many efforts and wearisome uncertainties, they perceive at length that the ties and the principle of a free government have their origin in a rational confidence, because confidence has its bounds, and distrust has none."

But Rousseau did not accept this apology for a sentence which branded him without judgment and without defence. He replied to the "*Lettres écrites de la campagne*" by the "*Lettres de la montagne*;" the political portion of which had the effect of neutralizing the impression produced by the prudent language of Tronchin. And yet this book, which is still read, for the sake of Rousseau's eloquence, by strangers indifferent to the quarrels of the

Republic of Geneva, contained lessons by which the representatives might have profited, had they been less blinded by their pretensions. To those who may or might have imagined that because of all the noise then made in Geneva, that city was a prey to an odious despotism, the victim of an aristocracy irresponsible and unpatriotic, this declaration of Rousseau himself may be cited. "Your magistrate is just in indifferent matters; I even believe him inclined to be so always; his posts are far from lucrative; he renders justice, and sells it not; he is personally honourable—disinterested; and I know that, in this most despotic council, uprightness and virtue always reign. In showing you the consequences of the right of negative, I have told you less what its advocates will do, when once they are sovereign, than what they continue to do in the hope of becoming so. Once recognized as such, it will be their interest to be always just, as it is even now to be generally just; but woe to those who shall dare to have recourse to the laws, and to claim freedom! Against them anything becomes allowable and legitimate. Equity, virtue, interest itself, cannot stand before the love of domination; and he who will be just when in power, spare no injustice to attain it."*

In point of fact, the cause of Rousseau was that which least touched the representatives, and they forgot him altogether when, in 1768, a fresh explosion of disturbance had wrung from the Senate an edict which transferred the authority from its hands to those of the representatives, or rather of their chiefs; the conquest not of liberty, but of a party, and which, under pretext of re-establishing harmony

* "Lettres écrites de la montagne," 2ème partie.

between the various orders of the State, established the independence of one only. It was no longer an effort for the reform of abuses, but for the humiliation of certain magistrates; and the *bourgeoisie*, as has been expressively said, accepted, in the edict of 1768, not the assurance of its rights, not the limitation of the power of its magistrates, but an increase of power in its chiefs.* The ungrateful neglect in which the victorious party left the remonstrances of Rousseau, was not the only fact which occurred to confirm the truth of the reproach addressed by the author of "Emile" to his friends, when he told them that, "at Geneva the essential had been always neglected in favour of the apparent; that attention should be directed less to authority, and more to freedom."

This success once obtained, and its superiority over the authority of the Senate established, the representative party showed little care for the grievances of a considerable part of the Genevese population, which had, nevertheless, by placing itself under that party's direction, lent it the formidable support of numbers and of passions combined.

* To complete the picture, it should be added, that, finally, by the mortification of the aristocracy, the lower order of the townspeople got the better of the higher; and this fatal and wretched distinction, which divided a small city into two, was the easily renewed source of these rancorous civil dissensions. Flournois, one of the chiefs of the representative party, admitted this himself, at the time, in a conference which he had with a distinguished magistrate, whose journal lies before us. "He concurred with me," writes M. Philibert Cramer, "on some general principles. He agreed in thinking that the separation of the *higher* and the *lower*, the difference of habits, the bestowal of offices by the aristocracy, the exclusion of several of the *lower* citizens, whom it offended, could not but produce dissension and acrimony. We agreed in all the preliminary points." &c.

In fact, up to this time, the only antagonism—the only question had been between the aristocracy on the one hand, and some hundreds of citizens on the other, (tradesmen mostly,) proud of their citizenship and of their ancient rights, which filled their heads even after having ceased to satisfy them. The whole political body of the nation was composed of a close council or executive power, of a Legislative Council, (the Two Hundred,) and of the Council General, or General Assembly of the citizens; and the entire question debated with so much increasing rancour, turned on the preponderance claimed by the Senate for its own body, for the Council General by the representatives. But these different bodies formed in reality but one half at the utmost of the population; the other being composed of strangers admitted to inhabitancy, and of their children and descendants, who, born in the territory of the Republic, and passing under the name of *natives*, constituted almost the entire industrial class of the population. Now, sojourners and *natives* were excluded from the liberal and commercial professions; nor were they eligible to the rank of officers in the military companies. Yet this class, brought up like others in the school of Calvin, felt themselves their equals in instruction and intelligence; in many cases, their fortune also bordered on opulence; and it may be easily conceived with how discontented and jealous an eye this class beheld the perpetuation of its constitutional disqualification for commerce and military dignities. In its turn, this class found its tribunes to express indignation in its name at the selfish neglect to which the representative party abandoned it after the acquisition of the edict of

1768. The representatives who had forced the aristocracy to share with them, but who had no notion of sharing with others, now displayed extreme irritation at the claims and remonstrances of the *natives*, and anger increasing on both sides, arms were taken up in 1770. After scenes of violence which did no honour to the representatives, the *natives* were quickly crushed; and the *bourgeoisie*, eager as it had been in denouncing the abuses of power, now uniting in its own person the three characters of legislator, of judge, and of party to the suit, decreed, without evidence, the proscription of the chief remonstrants, and denounced as a disturber of the public peace whoever should speak of the rights of the *natives*.*

* What was on the point of happening, in consequence of these vigorous measures, is well known. M. de Choiseul nourishing, for nearly three years, irritation against the Swiss and against Geneva, for the little deference paid to his advice in the interminable disputes on constitutional guarantees, was planning the construction of roads to divert from Geneva and the Pays de Vaud the transit of merchandize, and direct it to Versoix, a French village, on the banks of Lake Lemman, which might easily be made a port and a commercial town. Voltaire, who had received the impulse from the Minister, or possibly had communicated it to him, seized, with his usual avidity, the opportunity offered by the disturbances of Geneva, of rapidly colonizing both Versoix and his own Ferney. The discontent of the *natives* afforded him hopes that a considerable number of these industrious and intelligent workmen would establish themselves near him; and he neglected nothing to attract them, and, with them, that productive trade in watchmaking of which Geneva had at that time almost the monopoly; whilst, under the orders of M. de Choiseul, a port was being constructed at Versoix, and the streets laid down of a town destined to be a colony for the dissatisfied watchmakers. Voltaire received the emigrants in the most liberal

The cause of the *natives* had been advocated with spirit, and not without ability, by Béranger, the future historian of his country. After its defeat, it found a brave and unexpected avenger in Mallet du Pan, who had scarcely quitted the benches of the Academy. His family, his connexions, his social position—all naturally identified Mallet with the interests of the negative party. But the same generosity which, twenty years later, placed all the energy of his republican character at the service of an oppressed King, made him warmly embrace the cause of the *natives*. He had conceived an enthusiastic admiration of Béranger, a man of ardent and sensitive mind, of moderate and honourable character, who deserved the gratitude rather than the dislike of his opponents. With a sickly aspect, this chief of the *natives* had nevertheless an intrepid heart. In one of the popular tumults which pre-

manner, established them, provisionally, in his château, and was all on the alert to get his manufacture of watches into active operation. He was full of hopes; and, in his enthusiasm, wrote to his friends, M. d'Argental, the Marquis de Jaucourt, and the Duc de Richelieu: "I have received at my house the French watchmakers hitherto settled in Geneva; I have restored some fifty families to their country. My little château is full, at this moment, of Genevese refugees to whom I afford protection. I have wounded men about me; have lent money to these workmen to assist them in their business. The theatre-room, you know, is changed into a workshop; gold is melted; wheels are polished, where verses were declaimed; in six weeks' time they have filled, with watches, a case for Cadiz," &c.

The Minister Choiseul fell, and with him the colonizing project. In vain did Voltaire try to go on: his watches did not sell; the Government was apathetic. At length, Geneva saw its watchmakers, tired of sulking to no purpose, return to its walls.

ceded the crisis to which his friends were victims—at the moment when two bands of citizens and of *natives*, armed and furious, were on the point of firing, he threw himself between them, and, by his intreaties, and by his resolute bearing, forced his friends to retire, and thus spared the Republic a bloody contest. His name was not the less, however, placed first on the list of proscribed *natives*. No more was needed to excite the indignation of his young admirers. Mallet, careless what feelings he might kindle, published, under the title of “Compte rendu de la défense des citoyens bourgeois de Genève, par un natif,” one of the most violent performances which that troublous epoch produced.*

The motto, borrowed from Voltaire’s “Rome sauvée,” supplies a sufficient indication of the spirit of the production :

“Aujourd’hui nos tyrans, autrefois nos égaux.”

Such in fact, appeared to the young writer, the representatives and their leaders. The councils he merely accused of impolicy and cowardly weakness ; but he could not find terms strong enough to denounce the men who, after so many liberal declamations, had shown themselves such harsh despots. With the intractable severity of his age, he could see in the conduct of the Representative Commissioners nothing but iniquitous motives, or the impulse of ridiculous vanity. The commissioners were neither so criminal nor so absurd ; patriotism, as well

* “Compte rendu de la défense des citoyens bourgeois de Genève,” adressé aux Commissaires des Représentants, par un citoyen natif, 1771. A note by the Editors, attributes the writing to a supposititious M. Lambert : but the precaution was not in good earnest, and the true author, caring little to conceal himself, was soon known.

as interest led them, by dint of energy, to attempt an escape from the everlasting law which has always placed, and will always place the victors, in a contest, at the mercy of their auxiliaries. They had thought it politic to attract towards themselves a portion of the *natives*, by appearing generously to associate the two causes; but, after their success, they had counted with uneasiness the number of their allies, whom they perceived ready to become their enemies, and whose already imperious remonstrances seemed to them as dangerous to the Republic as the encroachments of the aristocracy. When age and experience had sharpened his penetration, Mallet became more indulgent to the chiefs of the *bourgeois*; at this time he saw only their inconsistency and the despotism of their policy. He accused them, with an almost insulting closeness of reasoning, of violating the natural rights they had been themselves foremost in claiming; and, referring to some street squabbles too well calculated to irritate, he imputed to the domineering pride of the citizens their malpractices against the popular class of artisans. "The majesty, the dignity, of the sovereign people," which the representatives were eternally talking of—such expressions from their mouths, seemed to him worse than insolence. "There is no medium," he says; "political inequality must be the consequence of moral inequality, or else be abolished altogether. Vainly has the attempt been made of making masters of equals. It was hard to perceive our masters in those who came sometimes to ask alms of us; and it was yet more hard to persuade our reason of the justice of their being so."*

* "Compte rendu," p. 31.

There are in this performance sound truths and political maxims firmly and well advanced; throughout we discover the stamp of a mind bordering on maturity. The vehemence of its accusations often exceeds the bounds of moderation and justice. Eleven years later, Mallet explained himself thus, relative to this, his first publication: "In 1770, at twenty years of age, I maintained what all magistrates, negatives, members of the popular party, have since maintained, that the *natives* had been wrongfully killed, condemned, or imprisoned. I maintained this in a publication not 'abominable' (as it was termed), but resentful, and often unjust—such as the fire of youth is apt to throw off."

"The 'Compte rendu,'" says a contemporary, "made a vivid and lasting impression; it became the text-book of the *natives*, who taught their children to read from it."* Perused with eagerness by the *natives*, with indignation by their adversaries, and above all by the representative chiefs, it created scandal; and a sentence of the Council condemned it to a fate similar to that undergone by "Emile" eight years previously, namely, to be torn and burned in front of the Town-Hall by the hands of the public executioner, as a libel, "seditious, derogatory to the honour of the State, the council, the citizens, and the burgesses"†

One can easily believe that this rigour of the magistrate was more than equalled by the severity which our audacious tyro encountered from his neighbours, especially

* "Mémoires inédits d'Isaac Cornuau," v. III, p. 438.

† Extract from the Minutes of the Lower Court, February 22nd, 1771. See the unpublished collection of cases extracted from these Minutes by M. Mallet Plantamour.

from the *bourgeois* who had fared so ill in his book. Doubtless, this ebullition of party spirit avenged on him in more ways than one the excess of his zeal for the *natives*; for in the following year, in virtue of the trials which he said he had already undergone, he dissuaded the Alpine painter, Bourrit, implicated like himself in these dissensions, from the strife of politics. "Content yourself," he wrote to him, "with two or three friends, your amiable wife, and your organ. So will you secure the health which at present you sacrifice to a mad passion for politics, and too restless an interest in what does not concern you."

Yet it was to his generous interest in the sufferings of the *natives* that Mallet owed the friendship of Voltaire, whose share in these quarrels is still unexplained.* This connection, which lasted till the death of the philosopher, was not the least severe test to which the independence of the future journalist was subjected. At the commencement of their acquaintance, Mallet set no bounds to the enthusiasm which the cordiality and conversation of a man, eminent in the art of adapting himself to each individual, could not fail to inspire. On the other hand, Voltaire discerned such talent and penetration in the politician of twenty, that without hesitation he recommended him to the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, who had applied to him for a professor of history and belles-lettres in his

* A celebrated historian, Count Alexis de Saint-Priest (of the French Academy), who is now occupied with an extensive work on Voltaire and his Times, will doubtless throw light on this strange incident in the connexion between the turbulent Republic and its restless neighbour.

Academy. Thus was early opened to Mallet a career well suited to his tastes, and to the peculiar qualities of his mind. He gratefully accepted Voltaire's proposal, and set off at the commencement of the year 1772,* full of ardour, and resolved, with all the sincerity of inexperience, to open the mind of his future hearers to the love of virtue and of truth. The address which he delivered to the Landgrave and his Court, on assuming the professor's chair, shows clearly what illusions were still entertained by this child of the eighteenth century, and at the same time what doubts and troubles were beginning to beset his precocious reason. He had adopted as the theme of his address the favourite question of the time: "What is the influence of philosophy on the belles-lettres?"†

Filled with gratitude to Voltaire, "the eagle who had condescended to inspire his youth;" still more deeply imbued with the republican sentiments of which he was a strenuous votary, Mallet, with that stern conscientiousness which never knew what it was to bend, did not fail to give full expression to his ideas of liberty, and his admiration of the high-priest of philosophy. Nevertheless, beneath this pompous and passionate eulogium, from the rhetorical emphasis universal in such discourses, there transpires, we

* The Landgrave writes to Voltaire on the 28th of February, 1772: "M. Mallet has, within these few days, delivered me your letter. He seemed to me a very sensible young man, and one who expresses himself very well. To complete his eulogium, I need only say, that he comes recommended to me by the Nestor of our literature."

† "Quelle est l'influence de la philosophie sur les belles-lettres, discours inaugural prononcé à Cassel, le 8 Avril, 1772," par M. Mallet, Professeur en Histoire et en Belles-Lettres Françaises. (Cassel.)

perceive, a severe estimate of that for which the orator's enthusiasm seems to be unqualified: it is felt that his homage is addressed to illusions and abstract conceptions rather than to realities. Here and there, the young professor enters into the very spirit of his age: he speaks of the increasing corruption, and of the decay of letters in terms which give earnest of rectitude of principle and independent observation.

"By what fatality," he says, "does it happen that, with so much philosophy, there are so few philosophers—so well-defined a morality, and so many irregularities? I know not: but it is a charge against us, that genius has succeeded in polishing our manners without improving our morals. It is but too certain that the season of degeneracy approaches; that, satiated with beauty, the taste palls, so that the meridian line of our discoveries is already in the shade. It is but too true, that in the train of political corruption, cupidity, luxury, and profusion, literature becomes debased, talents are degraded, feelings are blunted and callous. Labour wearies minds enervated by an epicurean life, and the intellect, finding effort a burden, falls into a lethargy. All its springs relax; its elasticity perishes; to great ideas succeeds mere verbal subtilty; till at last, as the son of the great Racine has expressed it, "wit becomes common because genius becomes rare."

Again, the words he addresses to his hearers in conclusion, are assuredly not the cant language of a disciple of the "Encyclopédie:" "I shall not give to the pupils of this Academy the lights and the genius which I possess not; but they will be constantly taught that, without morality, there is no talent—no philosophy; that they will

seek in vain for their own esteem, in learning, without integrity of heart.”

Meanwhile, Voltaire, who had not forgotten his *protégé*, wrote him the following letter, prudently intended to keep alive the favourable disposition of the Landgrave, and to moderate, at least as much as to encourage, the zeal of the professor, whose dangerous candour he knew.

“ My dear and amiable Professor, who will never profess anything but truth and a noble contempt of impostures and impostors, how happy are you in being with a just, good, and enlightened Prince, who tramples under foot infamous superstition, and identifies religion with virtue; who is neither Papist nor Calvinist, but a man, and who confers happiness on those who are subject to him! Were I younger, I would leave my snows for his, my sad climate for his sad climate, which he softens and makes agreeable by his uprightness and his goodness. A fair career lies before you. You can, by giving lessons in history in a new spirit, destroying the absurd lies which disfigure all histories, attract to Cassel a great number of strangers who will learn simultaneously the French language and truth. I had a friend named M. Audra, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, who despised the Sorbonne prodigiously, and who had gone to do at Toulouse what you are doing at Cassel. An amazing crowd came to hear him. Rascals trembled and combined against him. The priests managed to deprive him of the situation which the town-council had bestowed upon him. He died of grief. You will meet with a very contrary fate. By what fatality is it that the finest climates of the earth—Languedoc, Provence, Italy, Spain—are given up to the most loathsome superstitions,

whilst reason reigns in the North? But let us remember that it is the Northern nations who conquered the world: let us hope they may enlighten it Madame Denis and all at Ferney send all manner of compliments. I forward you the ninth volume of the "Questions," which is raising much clamour among the Genevese saints.—All good wishes to you."*

Voltaire was not so confident as he said; and it was half with pleasure, half with alarm, that, after reading Mallet's address, he wrote to d'Alembert, copying, according to his wont, one of the most vehement invectives against fanatics: "That, my dear d'Alembert, is what was delivered at Cassel on the 8th of April, in presence of the Landgrave, six princes of the empire, and a very numerous assembly, by a professor of history whom I bestowed on the Landgrave. I hope the same will not happen to him as to the Abbé Audra."†

The fact is, that the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, who called Voltaire the Nestor of literature; who, like his model Frederick, gave himself out as a royal disciple of philosophy, who wrote "*Des pensées diverses sur les princes*," for which Voltaire complimented him with extravagant homage, was playing a part, and Voltaire knew it well.‡ He feared that the grave Genevese, with his austere maxims, would at least be in bad odour. As for Mallet, he was not long in discovering that in the States of the Landgrave philosopher,

* "*Correspondance de Voltaire*," v. xi, Letter 27.

† Letter from Voltaire to d'Alembert, July 1st, 1772.

‡ This same Landgrave of Hesse subsequently made a lucrative speculation, by hiring his troops to the English Government in the War of Independence of the United States.

his philosophy and courageous intentions would have to be their own reward. In the following year, disgusted with his situation, he returned to Geneva. Voltaire appeared far from dissatisfied with him for this independent act, and he continued to see him frequently at Ferney; so that, next to his niece and his secretary, no one witnessed more closely the last years of the aged Voltaire. The testimony of so acute and independent an observer, esteemed by the philosopher—although he had already begun to display but little sympathy and confidence in the philosophizing sect—deserves to be collected as it shortly will be in these Memoirs.

CHAPTER II.

1773—1783.

Historical and political studies—Linguet—Mallet undertakes his defence, and contributes to his “*Annales politiques et littéraires*”—Letter from Voltaire to Mallet du Pan—Linguet at the Bastille—Mallet edits the continuation of the “*Annales*”—Character of the work—Acts of the American insurgents—Critical condition of Great Britain—The Abbé Raynal—Mallet attacked in reference to Voltaire—His reply—Anecdotes—Letter from Vagnères.

ON his return from Germany, Mallet had in the first instance retired to Switzerland, and had married there a young person from Aubonne, a small town in the pays de Vaud, distant some leagues from Geneva. In the calm of his retirement and of his modest household—for he had but little fortune—he soon resumed his labours with ardour; and, restored to his favourite reading and meditations, he advanced in the study of history with a spirit of reflection and a freedom of judgment which exerted eventually a beneficial and powerful influence over his principles. At first, however, young as he was, and still heated with his first campaign, he pushed too far his mistrust of systems, and, without perceiving it, was nearly falling into a scepticism far from congenial to the natural soundness of his reason.

“ I am convinced,” he wrote at this time, “ that we must leave definitions and metaphysical essays in order to return to experimental politics. It is from the sparks of historic truth that the torch of legislation must derive its light.” The urgent task of these “ experimental politics” invoked by him was that of “ healing the plagues sprung from aristocratic germs,” of at length relieving the mass of the people from the constantly increasing burden which the inequality of imposts laid on it alone, to the exclusion of the privileged classes. In other words, Mallet earnestly desired, for the happiness of nations, the establishment of civil equality.

In this condition of his political opinions, his interest was attracted to a man whose sense and talent deserved a better reputation than has survived him. This was Linguet, whom his colleagues, the advocates of the parliament of Paris, had just struck off the rolls of their order, to punish him, and at the same time relieve themselves from the sallies of his sarcastic humour. The real crime of this remarkable man, the true cause of his ill repute, was his character of perpetual contradictor of the favourite ideas of his age and country. He assailed the economists and encyclopædists, the “ *Esprit des lois*,” now definitively in fashion ; he praised the East at the expense of the West—a great audacity ; in fine, he attempted no less than the vindication of despotism and slavery. All the talent, the fertility of ideas which he poured forth to maintain these various contests, was unable to obtain indulgence from public opinion for the daring innovator ; and when, in contradiction for once to his own ideas, he took it into his head to adopt the most extreme revolutionary opinions,

it was too late. This self-negation was a final blunder, the shame of which the scaffold and a courageous death could not efface.

But at that time—in 1775—who could have foreseen such a conclusion? The angry prejudice of the persecutors of Linguet excited Mallet du Pan; and, without entering into the indiscretions which might have formed a motive or a pretext for these vexations, without personal knowledge of the famous advocate, he boldly came forward, if not to defend the man, at least to dispute the soundness of those theories which it had been his crime to attack. He took up, from this point of view, the examination of the “*Théorie des lois civiles*,” the most curious of Linguet’s works. In this book, which sparkles with wit, and in which are found mingled in profusion just views and extreme paradoxes, the audacious author maintains that there is no security or happiness for nations but under the invincibly paternal and protecting administration of a despot—that is, of a monarch enjoying his power by the same right as his subjects do their property, that of the simple fact. According to him, under any other system, civil equality is broken. The spirit of this book was simply, under the paradoxical form of a panegyric of despotism, an earnest protest against the civil organization of France. For the economic evils which bowed down his country, Linguet saw no specific but the annihilation of that mass of worm-eaten constructions and legislative anachronisms which composed the civil code of the French nation. As the example of the East would infallibly be brought forward against him as a triumphant objection, Linguet resolutely met the objection halfway,

and did not hesitate to eulogize the wisdom and liberty of oriental nations at the expense of that northern superiority so loudly vaunted by the philosophers. He even went so far as to uphold the legitimacy and utility of slavery, an institution coeval with society. "No solid confederation could have taken place without the enslavement of individuals (which Linguet distinguishes from political slavery). It is as impossible to establish a lasting alliance among men, if there are no serfs ready to work for others, as it is to form without horses a corps of cavalry. Every society stands in need of robust, docile, and indefatigable animals, to bear all its burden, and it is this function that slavery imposes on the unfortunate men it brands."*

Mallet, carried on in his turn by the indignation which filled him at the thought of the true iniquities of which most of the systems of the West and North give an example, ventured to demand of the adversaries of Linguet, who violently accused him of denying property as the basis of society, whether property, such as it actually existed, was not after all an usurper which maintained itself by monopolizing for its preservation all the forces of the law, and by unremittingly extending its encroachments; whether freedom was not the privilege of the man possessed of property; finally, whether the so-called protective inventions of economists and politicians might not be in fact lumbering machines adapted solely to double the burden of the majority.

Mallet was only twenty-five years of age when he ventured on this sally; for his "*Doutes sur l'éloquence et*

* "*Théorie des lois civiles.*" vol. ii. p. 257.

les systèmes politiques,"* is no more: a sally often lively and ingenious, often also obscure, against the accusers of Linguet and their reasonings borrowed from Montesquieu. At a more mature period, he would have mistrusted his own generosity, and the influence of his client's innocence. He would have known too that a solid, useful, and adequately intelligible work is not to be produced by retorting on arguments with doubts founded on approximations. He himself was the first to remark that in politics approximations are terrible.

If in its entirety this work, lacking method and precise purpose, is, in fact, according to the observation of Béranger, that of a young man who enters with sharp eyes on a land of which he is yet ignorant, individual thoughts are not undeserving of attention. It contains original remarks on eloquence, the economists, and party spirit. But the interest of this work, as of Linguet's theory, is that of presenting in the eighteenth century, on a stage where history no longer seeks them, prophets and promoters of that legislative revolution which the close of the century was to witness in conjunction with the French revolution. So far as these Memoirs are concerned, the "Doutes" would serve, in case of need, to prove that Mallet du Pan, if he was the ardent advocate of royalty against the revolution, was not so because he was born, as has been said, without sympathy for the nations. He will be seen, in the rest of his career, when more clear-sighted, continuing no less constantly faithful to the generous principles of justice and humanity to which his enterprising defence of

* "Doutes sur l'éloquence et les systèmes politiques." Londres; (Genève), 1775.

Linguet had given vent. Throughout his life, Mallet du Pan evinced a leaning towards the people which resisted even the horrors of the revolution.

The "Doutes" exercised direct consequences on the destiny of the young philosopher, by bringing him into relation with Linguet. The latter, after his expulsion from the order of advocates, had opened a new tribune. Some circumstances lead to the belief that the "Journal de politique et de littérature," founded by Linguet in 1774, received articles from the young writer: so that Mallet du Pan would have fought his first battle as a journalist under the auspices of the redoubtable advocate. A different god-father might assuredly have been desired for him; for Linguet with his caustic humour, his attractive character, and his passion for scandal, was then introducing into journalism the same species of insulting eloquence and personal satire of which he had set a deplorable example at the bar, to the great damage of his talent and reputation. On his arrival in Geneva, Linguet, already struck off the rolls of his order, on account of the opprobrium lavished by him on Gerbier and many of his colleagues, had just witnessed the suppression, by M. de Miroménil, the keeper of the seals, of the "Journal de politique et de littérature," which he had edited since 1774. In this miscellany, Linguet had assailed every power in Paris—ministers, parliaments, philosophers, d'Alembert and his sect. None had been suffered to escape either his daringly aggressive criticism, or that satirical contempt which his pen could inflict on his adversaries under the most piquant forms. Certainly there was much to be said of the society of the day, of the conduct and maxims of men in office, and more

especially of the increasing despotism over the men of letters who are subjected to the party of the "Encyclopédie." Linguet's offence was doubtless often that of being too much in the right ; but he combined with it, that of loving scandal even better than truth, and of preferring in all cases the satisfaction of inflicting a wound to that of refuting an error. Mallet also, too much allured by the originality of this really rare spirit, so boldly in rebellion against the leaders of opinion, saw only the courage of the combatant, and the conformity of their antipathies ; for he had been too intimate with the titular sovereign of the philosophers to esteem greatly the despotic ministers who swayed his intimidated old age.

Linguet resolved to establish his batteries out of France. He came to Geneva, and made his appearance at Ferney. There Mallet du Pan saw him for the first time ; and what he observed of the man did not seem to have dissipated his admiration of him. In reference to his visit to Voltaire, much was said of the alarm with which the intractable Linguet inspired the great man. After the three days he passed at Ferney, Voltaire was reported to have said, that Linguet weighed on his shoulders like a faggot of thorns, and that he had not had the courage to shake it off, so greatly did he fear, in casting it away, to be torn by them.* Other cutting words were attributed to him, which depicted energetically his horror of the man, more hateful in his eyes than Arétin : he called him "the first writer for supplying the charnel-house, beyond dispute." That Voltaire should have had no great love for the adversary of his Paris

* "Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Linguet," par M. Gardaz, Avocat à Lyon. Lyon, 1809.

friends ; that he thought himself bound to echo all the fury which the name of Linguet excited in them ; that he even stood in dread of him for his own sake—this is probable ; but Mallet always maintained that he had never heard from his lips anything but the frequent expression of a sincere interest in the misfortunes of Linguet, and of his esteem for his talents. This testimony would at least prove that Voltaire did not attempt to restrain Mallet, when, some time afterwards (in 1777), the latter started on a journey to London and thence to Brussels, where Linguet had decided on publishing his “*Annales politiques, civiles, et littéraires, du 18ème siècle.*”

The intention of the young Genevese writer was to come to an understanding with the editor, as to publishing a second edition of the journal on the continent. At London, he received from Ferney a letter in which Voltaire spoke kindly of Linguet and of his undertaking, hinting, under the form of praise, some excellent advice of which the journalist would have done better to avail himself. “You are going,” he wrote to Mallet, “to a country almost barbarized by the violence of factions : it is one of my great regrets that the eloquent man you will see there is unfortunate : he will require time to speak the language with ease : to how much embarrassment will this great weekly political work expose him ! It is so delicate a matter to attempt to recal a nation to its true interests, when it has deprived itself of all means of regeneration ! I question whether Xenophon would have dared to try it with the young Cyrus. But what gives me the greatest hopes is, that M. Linguet has the necessary qualities for accomplishing every enterprise,—courage and eloquence. I wish him success commen-

surate with his deserts. You know that, according to La Fontaine,

“Tout faiseur de journal doit tribut au malin.”

It would be well he should never feel himself in need of this resource:—indeed, he is too much above it. I shall see neither of you again; my great age and continual sickness dig my grave,”—&c.*

The “*Annales politiques*” were published successively at London and at Brussels, to which Linguet, coldly received by the English, had retired. Mallet was busily engaged on the Swiss edition; but this was not the only part he took in the publication of the journal. Opinions were much occupied at the time with political economy; indeed, the sect of economists seemed called, in the person of Turgot, to reform the administration of the kingdom according to its favourite theories. Linguet confided the treatment of the question to his fellow-labourer, who was more at home in this matter than himself. Mallet treated it in a sense opposite to the economists, but with a vigour which was noticed, although the honour was not attributed to him, Linguet alone being in the breach, and ostensibly sole editor of his journal. “It must be confessed,” says a biographer of Linguet, in revealing this co-operation, “that the numbers of the ‘*Annales*’ where political economy is discussed, are written in a sustained and uniformly correct style. There are not many passages in these voluminous ‘*Annales*,’ to be compared with them.”† To my thinking,

* “*Annales politiques*,” v. vii, p. 385.

† “*Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Linguet*,” par M. Garcoz, Avocat à Lyon. Lyon, 1809.

the biographer's remark is less applicable to these first "Annales" than to their sequels, of which we shall speak anon.

Weary of transporting himself and the least peaceful of newspaper-offices from England to Switzerland, from Switzerland to Holland received at first with politeness and a certain apparent warmth, but soon bowed off, Linguet, unable to bear it longer, disregarded his expulsion, and boldly made his appearance in Paris. Hardly had he arrived, when an order, the motives of which have never been exactly known, consigned him to the Bastille. It was in the autumn of 1779; and Mallet du Pan, on publishing the last number of the year, announced that the journal, although deprived of its editor, would continue to appear; that it was passing temporarily into other hands, to return to those of the author so soon as the royal justice and clemency should restore him to liberty. Undismayed by a task rendered singularly difficult and perilous by the audaciously personal tone to which Linguet had accustomed his readers, Mallet commenced, in the month of April, a new series of "Annales pour faire suite à celles de M. Linguet," that is to say, he continued, as regularly as he was able, to publish, twice a month, sixty pages of a journal which offered, with more extension and conscientiousness than his predecessor, an explanatory view of the political events of the two worlds;* general and

* Mallet requested, for matters of English politics, (and various circumstances warrant us in thinking he obtained) the communications of a young lawyer destined to realize a great reputation—Samuel Romilly. At any rate, his assistance was asked by a common friend, and a correspondence took place between the English lawyer

comprehensive reflections on interesting points of political economy; of legislation—in one word, on what we should at the present day call moral science. Literary news had also its place. The task was heavy, and sometimes difficult to accomplish: laborious and ardent, the new editor honorably sustained his undertaking. He had already published thirty-six numbers in two years, and was consequently fully justified in regarding the “*Annales*” as his own, when, at the commencement of 1783, Linguet, who had just issued from the Bastille, and resumed his journal at London, treated him outrageously in one of those characteristic articles of his, in which he was wont to bring himself and others personally on the scene.

Irritated against his former colleague, who had refused to send him some articles on recent political events in Geneva, he thought fit afterwards to denounce him as a surreptitious imitator.* Mallet replied with firmness and dignity, declaring that he relinquished the livery in which

and the Genevese journalist of sufficient familiarity to induce Mallet, some years later, to recommend warmly to his London friend another future celebrity—M. du Friche des Genettes—who was about to continue at London his medical studies which were already advanced. The “*Memoirs*” of Romilly, and the “*Souvenirs*” of Dumont, bear witness to the continuance of these friendly relations between Romilly and Mallet; and, when the latter took refuge in England in 1798, he was very cordially received by Romilly.

* “To deprive of all pretext those among them who availed themselves of my name to rob me, and called themselves my representatives, my subordinates, that they might gain credit for the fraud, I declare that I no longer sanction any secondary edition. I am responsible for none but that of London, published under my own eye.”—*Annales*, v. ix. 1783, p. 47.

he had appeared for upwards of two years, and that he restored his title of “*Annales civiles, politiques, et littéraires*,” to the “*Journal Helvétique*,” from which Linguet had borrowed it; in conclusion, that he purposed to continue, under a different name, a work which had never for a moment been copied from that of Linguet, and which he had the right to claim as his own original work. Dating from the month of March, 1783, his paper appeared under the title of “*Mémoires historiques, politiques et littéraires, sur l'état présent de l'Europe*,” with this motto: “*Nec temerè, nec timidè*.” Before narrating the circumstances that put an end to this publication, it is necessary to state what was its spirit, and what was the *début* of the future editor of the political portions of the “*Mercur de France*.”

The prevailing character in all parts of this miscellany—its reports, its opinions on political events, on civil or judicial institutions, on public morals—is an independence of judgment which one might be tempted at times to mistake for a taste for contradiction, did not its unvarying principles show us at the bottom of this apparently undisciplined criticism, a moral unity irreconcilable with the suggestion of a spirit of paradox. Impartiality is sometimes a pretence, or, even more easy, a comfortable indifference; nothing is more unlike Mallet's, who, always firm, but bitter and vehement, was not indignant by halves and praised with warmth.

But he was, of all men, the one least satisfied with appearance. As with the majority of thoroughly balanced minds, irreflectiveness, or inconsistency offended him even to irritation, and he grew more warm against folly than

the matter warranted. Hence a want of proportion, which sometimes deludes the reader, by introducing the writer's chief thought where he has only yielded to a secondary impression. The independence, as well as the soundness of his judgment, is not the less strong. Some passages of the "Annales" will serve to afford an idea of the manner in which the author observed and studied contemporary events.

At present, for instance, when the insurrection of Northern America is no longer a matter for conjecture, and when, judging it by its successful result and its illustrious chief, we look upon it as a grand event gloriously accomplished; it is singularly enticing to trace its progress, and see it judged of during each of its acts in the journal of a strict republican. Thus, when a decree of the Congress rigorously interdicts the Americans from all commerce, all correspondence, or relation with English subjects, and prohibits them from transporting any goods or effects to the possessions of the English King, Mallet does not hesitate :

"There is no impartial or judicious man," he says, "in whom this decree must not inspire the bitterest reflections, no one to whom it can appear other than an outrage against property, against even the true advantage of the United States. The most despotic sovereigns would not dare thus to harness men to the yoke by menacing their property. They would not dare to say to a subject: 'Be my slave, or I ruin you;' and it is in a country, which is in open rebellion, by a Government all whose manifestoes, all whose apologies, have appealed to the most extreme principles of the social contract; which has no title to power but that code of nature which it laughs to scorn at this

moment ; it is the avengers of the human race, the guardians of a philosophic legislation, who hang on their supporters chains more dreadful than those from which they have escaped ! . . .

“ This was not the policy, these were not the maxims, of the Swiss and the Batavians, whose imitators the insurgents profess themselves. Let a decree similar to that in question be sought in the annals of *their* liberty. The Prince of Orange did not hang the Dutch captain, who, caught in transporting munitions to the Spaniards, said to that great man : ‘ If there was a profitable trade with hell, I’d risk burning my sails there.’ ”*

The following is a picture of England in 1782, at the moment of her greatest danger, weakened within by parliamentary strife, and making head without against four hostile armies. The whole passage is remarkable, although subsequent events did not realize in all points the conclusions of the journalist. The following are extracts :

“ Misfortunes, resources, recurring perils, a power shaken but still terrible in the midst of its calamities, a stubborn courage, and the aspect of every public virtue in the heart of political corruption—such is the picture which England continues to present. All efforts possible to an empire—money, men, vessels, intrigues—everything is employed in order to fall with glory, or to triumph while involving herself in ruin. History offers no precedent of a nation of ten millions of souls attacked in the four quarters of the globe by a formidable league, and resolved to make head in all ; without allowing defeats, expenditure, the want of men, the burden of subsidies and of

* “ *Annales politiques*,” v. 1, p. 224, 226.

loans, to shake the firmness of its councils. Is this astounding spectacle the effect of the obstinacy of pride, or of a magnanimity encouraged by the recollection of successes and by self-esteem? Overwhelmed with taxes, indebted two hundred millions sterling, torn by party-spirit, enervated by wealth, corrupted by the thirst of gold, forced to transport the flower of her forces to a distance of two thousand leagues, how is it that England is not crushed by the efforts of her enemies? How, menaced—like Venice by all political prophets—with inevitable ruin, has she within these four years lost none but secondary settlements? I do not speak of the colonies: they ceased to belong to her as soon as France lent them her aid.

“It is because the true nerves of her power retain all their strength. Her marine is complete, her commerce preserved, the illusion of her credit still in force, but, above all, her enemies are wanting in concert. Instead of wasting itself in objectless movements, or in chance adventures, the Channel fleet has been throughout the summer actively watching for the return of the riches of commerce. These bear witness how little war has diminished them, and attest the opulence of the nation amid the dispersion of the public treasure. In two months’ space, we have seen five merchant fleets pour into the ports of England the tributes of the whole universe, and insult, by their return, four powers, whose forces have failed to close the Thames against them.

“From the Baltic, from Hudson’s Bay, from Jamaica, from the Windward Islands and the East Indies, immense and rich cargoes came to minister to the necessities of the State, while sustaining the fortune of individuals.

"This care in protecting the returns of her merchant marine by the aid of a fleet ever ready for the purpose, makes no noise in the papers. It occasions no firing of cannon or chanting of *Te Deums*; but it preserves individuals from the evils of war. So long as this circulation shall last, England will retain life and movement. So long as the capital of her merchant marine shall be circulating at the two ends of the world, an exchange for their treasures, so long as a maritime and commercial power shall lose neither her convoys, nor her war-ships, she will impose on the imagination by the energy of her efforts."*

If anything shows how superior to prepossessions was the judgment of Mallet, it is his articles on the marriage of priests, which had been proposed by some economist declaimers as the salvation of the human race threatened with depopulation. He controverts these absurd exaggerations, by statistics and some very simple reflections, which show that, with the exception of Rome and Naples, where a considerable surplus existed of the religious of all orders, the ecclesiastics and monks form in Europe but a very small fraction of the bachelors of all kinds. "The reform of the religious orders is not," according to him, "the secret of Cadmus. Its influence would be imperceptible. The clergy receives bachelors produced by the disorganization of society; but it does not make them."†

In some extensive reflections on the imperial edict of Joseph II., establishing the toleration of Protestants in his States, Mallet lays down with firmness the true principles of toleration, "principles equally remote from the religious

* "Annales politiques," v. III, p. 71, 72.

† Ibid., v. II, p. 326.

anarchy called toleration by the irreligious, and from the despotism of superstition."

In general, the "Annales" are distinguished by the novel and sound manner in which questions of political economy and legislation are treated. In this class of writing, an article on divorce, and one on the administration of criminal justice in Tuscany, in addition to the passage just quoted, would even now be read with interest. Mallet seized this opportunity to advocate with earnestness the necessity of legislative reforms; but he himself recommends moderation, and soundly rates the declaimers and indiscreet reformers who were then, as now, more occupied with their own part in the task than with the task itself. In referring to M. Necker's "Compte rendu," he had praised the exact and extensive views of the Director-General of Finances: "Visionaries," said he, "manufacture systems by overturning political economy in order to repair its defects—true talent corrects methodically." Elsewhere, while doing justice to the brilliant imagination, the strong and judicious ideas of Servan, who had just published some observations on criminal law, Mallet expresses regret that the desire of being eloquent sometimes overcomes the courageous magistrate's sound philosophy—and he adds:

"If anything diminishes the effect of these reflections on men of sense and governments, it is their frequent exaggeration. By dint of blaming all received opinions, you soon acquire false and monstrous ones of your own. From the prejudice of applauding whatever is current, you pass to that of seeing in it nothing but absurdity. You traverse the two extremes without stopping in the middle. Such is the character of what is called the philosophy of

the moment, and above all of that of the most celebrated writers. In politics, in religion, in public economy, in morals, in the arts themselves, as well as in style, one is thought superstitious, timid, and silly, if one does not become forced, excessive, and a destroyer of all existing institutions. It is with declaimers as with professional wits, who would think themselves bores if they were not constantly studying to raise a laugh.

“This impetuous character always indicates a want of reflection. It has filled all the speculative sciences with incomplete ideas and frivolous common-places ; it has passed into almost all the writings published against our criminal laws. A dozen examples might be cited from a theory of these matters, published by M. Brissot de Warville, puffed in all the papers, and in many respects deserving censure as much as applause.”

This is a page to be preserved by whoever would write the philosophic history of the eighteenth century. Those which the reader is about to peruse merit preservation no less ; they are truly prophetic reflections which conclude a searching and yet favourable notice of the famous work of the Abbé Raynal. The critic has just quoted and discussed the Abbé’s historical assertions and vehement attacks on religion and government ; and he proceeds :

“We venture to tell the estimable author of this work, that it is not imagination that can penetrate into the abstractions of political right. One cannot bring forth an universal legislation at the blasting of horns, as Joshua brought down the walls of Jericho ; noisy periods, oratorical movements, and eloquent generalities, are not all that is requisite. Some moderation, some reflection, is needed too ;

and one then ends by mistrusting all those trenchant principles, all those platonic dreams, all those extreme assertions, the delirious ravings of honest souls utterly useless for the relief of nations.

“What effect can M. Raynal have counted on from so many sallies against religion, against priests, against governments? Did one think as he does, one would deplore this fanaticism of truth; this is the very brain-fever of reason—the convulsions of philosophy.

“The author meets, in his tour round the world, not a single absurd opinion, not a single superstition, not a single religion, without recapitulating the history of Christianity, without pouring forth the bitterest scorn upon its dogmas, its rites, upon the priesthood, the intolerance, the crimes of fanaticism, the uselessness of all those deified impostures of which tyranny avails itself to brutalize the mind and enslave men.

“There is not one of these assertions but has been disproved with even wearisome repetition. A throng of preachers, before M. Raynal’s time, exhausted this dangerous and disgusting controversy. What can be gained by recording such thoughts among the reminiscences of foreign travel? What connection is there between the immortality of the soul and the cultivation of indigo; between Revelation and the settling day of our privateers; between Jesus Christ and Cortes; between Constantine and the Brahmins?

“Besides, to what end are these tirades? Does M. Raynal hope to expel the clergy, to induce the most liberal governments to equalize all sects, and accept all opinions? Has he weighed the influence of religious

principles on politics, on morals, on feeling, on duty, on the happiness and misery of a people?

“ Be their opinions what they may, let the philosophers view the character of the age, and answer whether this be a time to diminish the incentives to virtue? Wherewith shall we supply their place? With the laws? your ten volumes protest against their tyranny and absurdity: with forms of government? they are all corrupt: with education? this is perverted by the evil influence of our manners; it is a poor resource soon counteracted by the world's maxims, and destroyed by youthful passion: with interest? you yourselves tell us of the crimes to which it has led. What remains to us? Truth, to bear rule in the council, the professorship, and the conscience. I ask you then, as Festus did of St. Paul: “What is Truth?” Until the unanimous voice of all sages and of all the universe refutes me, leave their Paradise to the unhappy, and their remorse to the wicked.

“ These reflections are equally valid against all M. Raynal's maxims regarding the grounds and the abuses of authority. His is a code of anarchy and confusion. Every republican has a right to tell him that he will not find one friend of social liberty short-sighted enough to subscribe to it. Not one admits his position, that a political authority instituted a thousand years ago, can be abrogated to-morrow; that nations tempted to a change of government are in the same situation as at the first moment of their civilization, and that rebellion is justified by the mere recourse to rebellion.

“ Does M. Raynal mistake the empires and nations of Europe for so many hordes of Cadmucks, or tribes of

Cherokees? Let him restore to us our forests, our primitive independence, our tomahawks; let him deliver us from our vices, our riches, our passions—all the social encumbrances which stifle us; then, indeed, lordship and servitude will exist no longer; then the laws will be respected—because none are laid down.

“Till such time, hide your standards of revolt: *ere long they would be stained with the blood of your proselytes.* Believe that the most intolerable oppression, the most galling despotism, is that of all over all. To raise the people against tyranny is the duty of a citizen, but respect the rights of legitimate authority while you rouse subjects from the torpor of blind obedience. Let them bear many evils before provoking civil war, which unites in itself all evils. Forget not, that for one enslaved people who has purchased liberty with the price of its blood, twenty by their resistance have but obtained fresh masters and heavier chains.

“What avail then these frantic propositions? ‘*Until a King is dragged to Tyburn with no more pomp than the meanest criminal, the people will have no conception of liberty. The law is nothing, unless it be a sword suspended over all heads without distinction, and levelling all which elevate themselves above the horizontal plane in which it circles, &c.*’ Does this logograph of our Author provide subjects with armies whereby to make their executioners respected? Be it that they are slaves; but are not you guilty, who work the dagger in a closed wound until the sufferer writhes in torture; who take from him the sedative of illusion; who show to him a Prince, the father of his people, as the most execrable of despots; saying to subjects: Your master cherishes you, you revere

him—so much the worse; you are in the most abject of conditions. You call yourselves free; nay, but you will not be so until the public scaffold reeks with the blood of your sovereigns. This book was published without refutation in the very town where ‘Emile’ was burned, and its author condemned to be arrested.

“What remorse would not M. Raynal incur, were his fanaticism to infect the cottage of a labourer, or the workshop of an artizan? If read by the lower orders, what could these subversive maxims breed in them, but impotent sorrow, and the fury of despair?

“Happily, the people do not read; but the government is aroused, and becomes provoked by these repeated insults. It repays the outrages offered it; the holiest maxims lose their influence; Truth itself falls into discredit; the yoke is made heavier; abuses are defended as the most sacred rights; all innovation is staved off; the most useful institutions are forbidden or put down, for fear of giving rise to too large an extension of liberty. When a nation runs into excess, it provokes excess in the government also, whose eyes, opening to the abuse, close against the light.

“No one will suspect us of having in these remarks pronounced a vindication of despotism and superstition. The spirit of servile intolerance justifies everything, enshrines everything, adores everything; the anarchists blame all, attack all, destroy all. An arbitration must be introduced between folly and licence.”*

* Continuation of the “*Annales Politiques*,” v. i. p. 251—258. It is well known that these incendiary diatribes, introduced into the “*History of the two Indies*,” are the work of Diderot. “These spurious passages,” Mallet du Pan observes elsewhere, “are easily

The “*Annales*” offer, here and there, literary criticisms of some worth. The chronicler of criticism in the eighteenth century, should notice among other valuable passages, a slashing criticism of Condorcet’s Commentary on the “*Pensées de Pascal*,” in which Mallet disposes of the discovery of the philosophers as to the infidelity of Pascal, who was said to play at toss-up with the immortality of the soul; an article on Voltaire, viewed as a historian, occasioned by Mably’s work on the Art of Writing History; a clever sketch of Rousseau, as he appears in his “*Confessions*,” then about to come out; finally, an instructive summary of the state of literature in 1783, in which Mallet advocates without blind prepossession, but with thought and talent, the dramatic school of Shakspeare. But among these attacks on the literature of the eighteenth century, none is more worthy of notice than Mallet’s gallant defence of Voltaire against the charges levelled at him by ill-regulated zeal, and against the silence of his friends. He maintains, that the renowned chief of the philosophers was not an Atheist; and wishing to prove this by his personal recollections of Voltaire, he was led to throw a curious light on the last days of the celebrated author.

It is well known that after the death of Voltaire, three claimants, Clément, Palissot, and Beaumarchais, disputed the distinction of publishing his works; a fact which gave

distinguishable by the virulence of their style. I saw the agreement and the amount paid into the hands of M. D—, an ex-commissioner of taxes, who struck the bargain between Raynal and Diderot. The latter received from his colleague ten thousand livres (of Tours) for those bombastic interpolations, which serve as a prelude to the revolutionary *code*.”—*Mercure britannique*, No. 14.

promise of a most complete edition. At this announcement, an outcry was raised ; successively there appeared an episcopal edict, and a denunciation to the parliament of the subscription for the works of Voltaire, bearing this motto : “ *Ululate et clamate.*” The newspapers had commenced hostilities, and continued them for some time. The author of the “ *Annales* ” took no part in them. He received a spirited letter demanding the reason of his silence—why he did not unite his voice to the cry of public indignation. “ You owe it,” he was assured, “ you owe it to the public, to society, to the interest of families and of consciences, to the spirit of your own work, and to the confidence which you must wish to inspire, to devote an article in your paper to this important object.”

Mallet replied that he should persist in not *howling*, and concisely stated his reasons. The following passages are quoted from his answers :

“ I do not consider that history ought to be a record of crime, or that the business of an annalist is to put on a level Voltaire and Desrues. Reverence for the essential truths of religion should not, to my thinking, make us represent their impugnors as wretches worthy only of the stake. We must confute them with force and enlighten them with moderation ; such is the spirit of the Gospel. Every wise writer must undoubtedly protest against the overthrow of religious principle, which is closely connected with social order : let him combat systems whose influence, were they adopted, would fill the world with bold bad men, while they robbed virtue of its incentives and its consolations : let him strengthen all the bonds that unite man to his Creator ; let him humble himself with all mankind before

the supreme rule of that God of vengeance, who watches over the universe : let him defend his altars, his faith, and his appointed means, whenever their ministration is not dishonoured by fanaticism or superstition. He owes this to his country, to reason, to the religion of the State, which is as inviolable for him as the civil laws, for none else is the defender of morality and the monarchical institution ; but his duty ends where the right of authority commences ; he is not a magistrate to condemn and to brand, and to prepare a scaffold for licence and error.

“These principles, from which no private interest will induce me to recede, once laid down, it is unnecessary to seek motives for my reserve, in my respect for philosophy or for the *manes* of its chief.

“More than this, I deplore as much as yourself the aberrations of this fine genius. I mourn over the melancholy productions of his decrepitude, over the kind of rage that animated him against the clergy and the Scriptures, over that monotonous jesting on the most momentous subjects by which he abused his rare wit ; over the audacious reminiscences with which he wearied the public in his latter days. One cannot hide from oneself the terrible influence which his many diatribes exerted upon the mind of young people, upon the maxims of the age, upon numbers of undisciplined authors who sheltered themselves under the example of Voltaire only to abuse it, and compelled even him to warn them of their excess.”

This frankness in a man, who for eight successive years was connected with the recluse of Ferney, who received from him obligations and guidance, who knew him intimately enough to appreciate him, whose esteem for his

talents and for his person is only the more unchangeable because founded neither on prejudice nor on agreement of opinions: this frankness, Sir, emboldens me to complain of the rashness of the assertions contained in several writings now before me.

“I except the edict of Monseigneur the Bishop of Amiens. The *prospectus* announced in the advertisements of Picardy, with as little reserve as if they advertised a catechism, might justly arouse his zeal. In guarding his flock beforehand against the approach of the enemy, he fulfilled his duty. Had he used exaggeration no one could have blamed him; moreover, this Prelate’s edict is far less violent than the anonymous denunciation, and less absurd than the petty crackers of the periodicals. Let not similar mercy be shown to this ridiculous artillery. Indeed, the eloquence of these apostles bears too much resemblance to the declamation of a capuchin. A satire against La Brinvilliers would not have been worse done. For my own part, I confess, I would rather be the author of the line

“ ‘ Si Dieu n’existait pas, il faudrait l’inventer,’

than an anonymous accuser, stigmatizing before that God, and before men, the author of this line as an atheist.

“Never did Voltaire in private life belie his publicly expressed opinions. Whether ill or well, gay or serious, with Christians, atheists, deists, or indifferentists, he always professed the same respect for natural religion. I was one day present, when at table he gave a striking lesson to a devotee of infidelity, who wished to overturn that salutary barrier against crime, the fear of remorse and,

of the Sovereign Arbiter of the universe. The old man, having made his domestics quit the apartment, said to the audacious wit: *I beg your pardon, Sir, but I wish my servants to believe in conscience and in the Divinity.* The well-known writer, who will recognise himself when he reads this, blushed and was silent.*

“Another anecdote will enforce his opinion in a perfectly authentic manner, and under remarkable circumstances.

“Three months after the publication of the ‘*Système de la Nature*,’ he received an enthusiastic letter from the heir-apparent to a German State. The Prince did not conceal the fatal influence which the book had excited over him; he appeared an ardent proselyte to its doctrines. Voltaire, in offering his opinion, refuted these doubts, and concluded his reply with these words: ‘In one word, your Highness, I consider the book pernicious to peoples and to Kings. Nothing but a detestable mania can attack so holy a religion as that which teaches us to adore God and to act uprightly.’ This letter I have read, and I do not speak of it on hearsay.†

* Elsewhere, Mallet relates this well-known anecdote with a slight difference: “I saw him (Voltaire) one evening at supper give a terrible lesson to d’Alembert and Condorcet, by sending all the servants from the apartment in the middle of the meal, and then saying to the two Academicians: ‘Now, gentlemen, continue your witticisms against God: but as I do not wish to be murdered and robbed to-night by my servants, they had better not hear you!’”

† Mallet had become convinced, in his frequent intercourse with Voltaire, that the latter, toward the end of his life, was the satellite, not the master, of the encyclopædists. “From the date of his ‘*Oedipus*’ to that of his ‘*Irene*,’ he always held that course with no intermission. He acted even on a very singular policy: he rekindled

“ The rancour of Voltaire against revealed religion was nothing less than a disease. It was the fever of a mind corrupted in its youth by the licentiousness of the regency, by *Temple* intimacies, and his familiarity with Pope, Swift, Bolingbroke, and the Duke of Dorset, in England; and excited by the persecutions and troubles of the Cévennes, by the contemptible disputes concerning grace, by that spirit of

his literary throne than any conqueror, he imitated that king who, in the hope of reigning in peace, promised the succession to everybody. Not an insect crawls in the literary world whom he has not, in his turn, pointed out as his successor in some one of those comical diplomas which issued in such strange multiplicity from his cabinet. Such cajoleries would be unintelligible were we not perfectly aware that he had two doctrines—one for the public, the other for the initiated; and that the Voltaire of private friends was far different from the courtier of the encyclopædists. He shrank as much as any one from their doctrine and their character; but he regarded them as the base of the pedestal on which he had mounted; and in order to subject all the subordinate trumpets of the orchestra, he took the greatest pains to keep terms with its leader. Never has there been among men of letters a stranger compact than that which united M. de Voltaire and M. d'Alembert. By a tacit understanding between them, the *poet* was in a chronic ecstasy at the literary talents of the *geometer*, and the *geometer* at the profound philosophy of the *poet*. No sooner did an antagonist couch his lance at the weak point of the cuirass of one, than the other interposed to shield him. Rhyme and compass, thus once united by this artifice, became a sceptre stretched forth from Kamtschatka to the Pyrenees; but the old man in his seclusion knew well, in spite of the score of crowns piled upon his head, the advantage possessed over himself by his active colleague, who domineered in two Parisian Academies, and guided a world of fashionable gossip, &c. To him therefore, he paid redoubled attention in his latter days. He dedicated tragedies to him, and he addressed to him an epistle, which is, however, the most insipid and prosaic of all the misplaced witticisms of his old age.”

intolerance and fanaticism which possessed the end of Louis XIV's reign, and dimmed its glory. These sanguinary or ridiculous quarrels, affixed an indelible stamp on the youthful mind of Voltaire. From the Bastille, he thundered forth in "*la Henriade*" his horror at this oppression of men's consciences. Go back, as M. Palissot strikingly observes, to the time when the fearful truths of the second canto were enounced in sublime verse, and by the courage of the poet, measure the influence of that miserable epoch upon his genius.

"The persecutions which assailed him served but to strengthen this influence. His abode in Germany, the murder of Calas, and the execution of the Chevalier de La Barre put the finishing stroke to his intolerance of all restraint. His obstinate infidelity was not fostered by interest, or vanity in forming a sect; or that desire of excusing his vices which has been too absurdly imputed to him: a laborious old man, passing twelve hours of the day in his study, was assuredly no conscience-stricken libertine. Mere hatred against a doctrine deformed by his own notions, and which he thought calculated to imbrue the world with blood, and prejudice strengthened by his personal feelings—such were the sole springs of his mania."*

This testimony borne to Voltaire's views concerning natural religion, brought upon its author, as he himself informs us, numberless objections and reproaches; but at the same time a grateful letter from poor Vagnière, who for twenty years had written at the dictation of Voltaire:

"The lessons which I received from my old master," the devoted secretary says to Mallet, "induce me to write

* "*Années politiques*," v. 1, p. 292—307.

to you, that I may express my gratitude for the manner in which you have defended and done justice to a man who entertained for you all the esteem which you deserve. I, more than any other, can bear witness to the truth of what you assert regarding him and his opinions, and I do so most heartily, and with the greatest satisfaction, begging you to avail yourself of my testimony should you think fit. I could have wished that my capacity for defending him myself had been answerable to the strength of the gratitude which I shall all my life preserve for the friendship and the confidence with which he honoured me. You are, without knowing it, the interpreter of my feelings, and even of M. de Voltaire's. You knew him long enough to be able, like myself, to bear witness to his true sentiments. The pain and regret which his lamented end, and the circumstances which accompanied it, left in my heart, fill my days with bitterness, after having nearly killed me with grief. Unfortunately for me, that great man's mantle has not fallen on me, like Elijah's on Elisha. My only merit is that of feeling the sincerest admiration of him; no one takes more interest than myself in the glory of M. de Voltaire. Your answer comforted me after the accusations that had been preferred against my old master, though I cannot always concur in the severity of your judgment upon him.

“I have the honour, &c.”*

The letter of the grateful Vagnière only served to excite redoubled attacks on Mallet. A threatening letter was even addressed to him from Versailles, but he was unable to decipher the signature, which had been purposely rendered illegible:

* “*Annales politiques*,” v. iii. p. 258.

"You take the most extraordinary steps, Sir, to push your journal," it was said: "all my friends, and among them men of enlightened mind, regret to find in you a free-thinker, *whose principles cannot be ascertained*. In announcing yourself as the successor of M. Linguet, you were expected to declare yourself, like him, the enemy of the philosophic sect, *to respect religion*, and to adopt its defence whenever an opportunity occurred—to tread in the steps of that celebrated journalist in all respects. And now you place yourself in complete opposition to his tendencies by becoming the panegyrist of Voltaire—an author truly dangerous to society and morals. . . . In your reply to the Abbé de L——, your friends were shocked to find you perfectly devoted to that too famous infidel." After some arguments intended to show that Voltaire's law of nature bears a strong resemblance to the theory of Hobbes and Spinoza, the correspondent concluded thus: "Believe me, I can be useful to you—*I can also injure you*: either employ your talents in eulogizing the virtuous, in advocating respect for governments, in spreading useful knowledge, in protecting religion, in upholding its ministers, or abandon a literary undertaking which can only be fatal to you, &c."*

Mallet, thus fiercely attacked, replied in the first instance that he had written his reflections on Voltaire "because, having been intimate with Voltaire for eight successive years, and that at the very time when he was inundating Europe with his indecent gibes, he had never once detected him in a single sally, a single doubt as to the existence of a beneficent God derivable from the law of nature."

* *Journal de Mallet*, 1789, p. 10.

“But in fact,” he observes with truth, addressing his correspondent, “I did not pronounce a panegyric on Voltaire. You seem to consider that a repugnance at seeing a man burned alive amounts to a praise of the victim; and the stake, according to you and the denouncer of the prospectus, is the safe medium between the adoption and the censure of a writer’s errors. Allow me to dissent from such a touching exposition of law, and to see in Voltaire the abuse of wit and of talent, without looking upon him as an accomplice of Voisin, and worthy of dying at the stake. This distinction forms the gist of half my article. It is not an apology of the recluse of Ferney, but a vindication of the rights of decency, justice, morality, and public honesty, against the virulence of jaundiced minds. It is fanaticism I attacked, not impiety I defended; and no sensible reader saw the matter in a different light.

“How long has it been a crime for criticism to examine closely the true opinions of illustrious men? What offence is committed by discrediting the imputed atheism of Voltaire, as of hundreds of philosophers accused and absolved of that odious imputation? What kind of disservice, I would fain know, am I doing to Christianity? Let me, in my turn, offer you a piece of advice. You and your rabid journalists, and all the antagonists of the philosophers, have shown bad policy. If, instead of confounding them all indiscriminately in your denunciations, you had ably contrasted the members of their own sect, you would have overwhelmed them reciprocally. J. J. Rousseau offered you the opportunity: you had not the sense to profit by it. On the appearance of that “*Système de la Nature*,” the work of a man melancholy-mad—fit for a roadhouse—Voltaire

offered you his best aid to crush its partizans. You gained him new proselytes by attacking the system and its refuter simultaneously.

“ You pretend to be unacquainted with my principles. They are these: you may communicate my confession to your ‘enlightened’ friends. My principles are those of a Genevese citizen, brought up in the Calvinistic faith—that of his fathers and his sovereign—of one who has learned by the excellent education received in that country, and by the example of a virtuous and enlightened clergy, to worship the hand of God in his works, and in the boon of revelation; to be religious without superstition, and tolerant without impiety. If this creed does not suit you, I regret it, but I shall not alter it to gain your goodwill, and avert the effect of your threats. These doctrines, the morality to which they lead, the character they form, the spirit of liberty which, when guided by prudence, is the spirit of reason, will be patent in these “*Annales*” as long as I retain strength to hold a pen. I shall continue to be truthful without harshness, and just without bowing before any human obligations. All that you preach, I do. There is not a number of this journal which has not anticipated your instructions. You are like an officer who should strike with his cane a soldier covered with wounds, to incite him to encounter the enemy.”*

The reader will doubtless appreciate the soundness of these reflections, and the courage of a writer who, amid that strife of extreme and irreconcilable opinions which then agitated France, addressed to his relentless antagonists words so true, so rational, and we may well say,

* “*Annales politiques*,” v. II, p. 442—445.

so eloquent. They appear to us to convey a high idea of the character of their author. It were to be desired that Voltaire had been always estimated with the same moderation ; we should not have seen impatience dictate even to men of ability those eternally renewed apologies, which are far more wearisome than would have been the extreme of latitudinarianism. To attempt to persuade Frenchmen that Voltaire's genius is nothing but wickedness from first to last, infallibly revolts their common sense as well as their national pride ; it is enlisting their sense of honour on the enemy's side.

CHAPTER III.

1781—1782.

Fresh disturbances at Geneva—The “*Idées soumises par un médiateur sans conséquence*”—The Genevese Revolution of 1782; its analogy to the French Revolution—Geneva invested by the troops of Berne, France and Savoy—Excitement of the people—Mallet sent on a mission to M. de la Marmora—The city opens its gates—Account of these events in the “*Mémoires politiques*”—Brissot at Geneva.

STORMS always attended the career of our politician. The “*Annales*” were composed amid the dissensions of Geneva, and Mallet left an article a score of times at short intervals to mount guard on the ramparts of the city environed by the troops of three States. Since the appearance of his “*Compte rendu*,” ten years had elapsed; during which, in absence, or immersed in his studies, he had not taken an active part in any of the domestic disputes of the Republic, resigning to other pens the task of enlightening the universe—for vanity had combined with party-spirit to turn the heads of the Genevese past remedy. Besides, the position of his old *protégées*—the *natives*—had changed considerably. Oppressed, when he had courageously undertaken their defence in 1770 against the *bour-*

geoisie in league with the aristocracy, they were at present courted and petted by the two parties, now in open rupture. The tactics of their new chiefs—acting under the advice, as it was reported, of Voltaire—consisted in making their influence so strongly felt in the affairs of the Republic, that the aid of the *natives*, becoming indispensable, should have to be bought by one party or the other, and rewarded by equality not only of civil rights, but of those political privileges for which they had hitherto hoped against hope.

Whether this manœuvre was contemplated or not by the *natives*, Mallet had gained too much political experience to sacrifice to a portion of the population the security of the whole Republic. This appeared to him most seriously threatened by the fanatical strife of the parties whom he perceived resolved, the one to extricate itself from the inferiority to which forced concessions had reduced it, the other still further to fetter its rulers by a code of laws which would make them altogether dependent on itself. These two elements of aristocracy and of democracy, whose perilous association had long been the mainspring of the political constitution of Geneva, less likely than ever to coalesce, were evidently bent on dissolution: each of the two powers, while still speaking of equilibrium, sought to absorb, or at least to govern, the other. However, justice, no less than truth, compels the admission that the more exacting and imperious of the two parties was not that of the Senate. That body cannot be condemned for aiming to preserve itself from the dismissals which, under the very inappropriate name of re-election, the citizens had assumed the right of inflicting upon it, without stint.

much less can the attempt be imputed to a spirit of selfish ambition. In 1777, Voltaire had written to Florian: "The democratic power of Geneva has just dismissed three Syndics at one stroke. The fact excites no attention: no civil war will ensue; no one troubles himself, except about risking his fifty louis in M. Necker's lottery."

Voltaire's opinion was not long borne out by facts: these grievances were not forgotten. Rancour was fermenting; and the representatives, suiting the measure of their mistrust to the diminished control over their power, urged their new legislative projects with the more impatience in proportion as they perceived the growing irritation of their victims. What complicated the situation and rendered it exceedingly perilous, was the certainty that France and the Swiss cantons, as guardians of the Constitution ever since 1738, would be involved in the dispute as arbitrators. What attitude would the Government of Louis XVI. assume? What would be hazarded by the tolerably bold policy of M. de Vergennes? In that quarter all was to be feared. It was well known that the minister did not consider the political discussions of the Genevese matter of no moment; that he styled them "catechisms of revolt," and that he would not allow Geneva to degenerate into a turbulent and dangerous democracy.

Mallet, deeply impressed with a sense of the perils into which the Republic was plunging headlong, tried to cut short party discussions by proposing to realize that famous "equilibrium," the theme of so many empty disputations, in some other form than that of tortuous laws, and the lamentable power of dismissal conferred upon the people. Breaking the silence which, since his first appearance as

an author he had maintained concerning public affairs, he published towards the close of the year 1780, a Treatise entitled: “*Idées soumises à l'examen de tous les conciliateurs par un médiateur sans conséquence,*” and he boldly proposed to introduce the principle of *removability* into the offices of state, as the only means, according to his views, of guaranteeing the maintenance of the Constitution against the encroachments of power and the indiscretion of democratic zeal; a means sanctioned by the successful experience of more than one modern commonwealth, and which would have possessed the advantage of introducing no fundamental change into the functions of the orders of the government—in a word, of adding no new principle to the Genevese Constitution. This was of great importance in Mallet’s opinion. He thought, like Bacon, that everything is so closely knit in a political system, that the slightest novelty will never agree with the tissue so well as a part already worn. “Every transposition of power is inappreciable in its effects,” he said, “let us be content to regulate it by mild institutions.”

He commenced by showing that removability had in its favour the prosperous experience of the wisest modern Republics, and the sanction of historians and philosophers, of Livy and Tacitus among the ancients, of Montesquieu and especially M. d’Argenson among modern writers.* But he was fully aware that the example of two Republics, and the authority of the whole body of philosophers would not satisfy this nation of political argumentalists:—“Our subtle and controversial politicians yield only to argument; let us

* This magistrate’s “*Considérations sur le gouvernement de France*” stood high in Mallet’s esteem.

then see about arguing." In fact, Mallet discusses the question with superior ability. Fifty years later, a jurist whose judgment is of weight said of the "*Idées d'un médiateur sans conséquence*:" "The Treatise of Mallet du Pan will be always read with interest. It is distinguished from the crowd of our political pamphlets by the soundness of its reflection, and the force of its arguments. The advantages of removability are presented with the greatest effect, chiefly in reference to our special circumstances."*

The good sense and moderation of tone in this pamphlet strikingly arrest attention; the author, more a moralist even than a legislator, enlarges on the true state of opinion, habits of mind and character, of the small nation which, prosperous and without enemies, is thus hot on the question of its form of government. He aims at giving the Genevese a correct idea of their position. To those who might object to removability on the ground of the difficulty of finding every four years a sufficient number of competent magistrates, he addresses this witty and sensible advice: "Let us diminish the range of our glass. We have not two continents to govern. The whole question is of the government of a city, and of a third-rate city. Geneva, a political maggot on the map of the world, has no occasion before it can be set going, for the legs of a stag, or the eyes of an eagle. What most surprises strangers is the frequency and seriousness of disputation in

* Bellot, "*Rapport présenté au conseil représentatif de Genève, sur l'amovibilité du conseil exécutif, le 20 Juillet, 1831.*" The representative council at that time numbered among its members such men as Sismondi and Rossi.

a city for which a police government would be sufficient. Integrity and good sense—these are the primary requirements for the magistrate of a small commonwealth. Acquaintance with its laws and its modes of conduct, and a little experience are all the learning he needs.”

The “*Idées*” were warmly welcomed by all the superior minds and honest men in Geneva, who were not possessed with a passion for the triumph of their opinions, or, to speak more precisely, their antipathies. But since the time when the diversity of opinion had degenerated into a state of permanent faction—the selfishness of cabal, pride, and obstinacy—systematic hatreds not yet extinguished, and inextinguishable, had replaced patriotism and the sense of duty.* Argument continued *ad infinitum* relative to the guarantees demanded by one party, and refused by the other; and which afforded a fine field for wrangling, as nothing

* It will not be irrelevant to the history of political ideas in the eighteenth century to note here that, even prior to this period, another attempt at liberal, but not democratic, reform had similarly miscarried. In 1767, a formal proposition for the adoption of the representative system was rejected by Clavière and the leaders of the *bourgeoisie*, who were stubbornly attached to the dogma of popular sovereignty. (This abortive attempt of the aristocracy is narrated, with some curious details, in the unpublished journal of a magistrate of the Republic, M. Philibert Cramer, already quoted. Thus, in the middle of the eighteenth century, there already existed a certain political temper, aroused much less by Rousseau than by men’s passions, and which rejected the liberty of the representative system as insufficient;—a significant proof that it was not so much the English ideal of constitutional government—as is often said at the present day—which excited men’s minds and led to the errors of the French Revolution, as the democratic and revolutionary spirit itself.

specific was stipulated.* The collection of Genevese pamphlets of this period, and on this subject, is a formidable one. Mallet du Pan used to confess that he had never been clever enough to understand a syllable of the innumerable definitions, distinctions, subtleties, and argumentations, of the Genevese on these questions. "It is," said he, "the quintessence of obscurity, and the *ne plus ultra* of metaphysics; I defy the most experienced controversialists to have ever reached this pitch of dialectics. I venture to believe it above common sense." The Genevese, however, finding themselves an object of attention, and deeming themselves under an obligation to do credit to the author of the "Contrat social," disputed incessantly, interrupting themselves only to take up arms. Sometimes they were content with giving full play to political lampoons; this was the peace-footing; but soon recommenced a deluge of printed declamations of "half a hundred moutthers, proud of appearing in the eyes of Europe interminable bores."

In the meantime, irritation was at its height, and the French court, to which the aristocratic party had imprudently applied in preference to the other protecting powers, only increased the excitement by the dictatorial tone of its decisions: that which the Senate was fully justified in requiring, the suspension of those humiliating arrangements

* The history of Geneva in the eighteenth century is contained in these three lines of Voltaire, on the disputes of the Genevese :

"Chacun écrit, chacun fait un projet,
On représente, et puis on représente ;
A penser creux tout bourgeois se tourmente."

which only fear and surprise had ever induced it to concede, the minister and his satellites insisted upon. Less than this would have sufficed to exasperate the republican susceptibility of the representatives. Remonstrances were addressed to the Senate by the Procureur-Général of Roveray; the French Court, considering itself insulted, demanded the dismissal of that magistrate. Then dissension sprang up; an appeal was made to arms; the representatives, victors without striking a blow over a handful of *negatives* or aristocrats, for some days kept prisoners the Senate and its party, whom envoys from the cantons, confiding in the guarantee, extricated not without difficulty. These arbiters endeavoured, but in vain, to pacify the Republic. Political disputes to be assuaged, conflicting claims to be conciliated, furious passions to be restrained, excited declaimers and few citizens—this was what the Swiss plenipotentiaries found at Geneva, and what they left there at their departure. The contagion of discord had infected them also, as was plainly evidenced in the endless conferences that soon after commenced at Soleure, in the hope of pacifying the Republic. “For six months the suit was carried on,” says Mallet, “to ascertain whether the King of France and two Swiss cantons had a right to propose conditions of peace. It would have been simpler and wiser to arrange them for oneself; but men were not yet tired of disputing.”

Already, moreover, the principal representatives were no longer masters of their own movements; the *actives*, whom they had now gained over by means of large promises, urged them to fulfil their engagements, and compelled them in 1782 to join them in taking up arms. In one

night during which two battles raged at the city-gates,* a revolution was effected, commenced by the people and the *native* community, and completed by the weakness or the will of the *bourgeois*, who, instead of counteracting the dangers consequent on this recourse to arms, decided on restraining excesses by sharing in, and then lamenting over them.

Mallet du Pan narrates in a masterly and energetic style, the revolution which he had foreseen and vainly endeavoured to avert. We will let him speak for himself.

“While a portion of the magistracy, arrested overnight, is ignominiously led from one prison to another in open day amid the acclamations of the populace, and sentenced to be confined in a private gaol, the remnant of the Senate are assembled to hear the sentence of the senators, and to conform to it. They are ordered to abolish themselves: the dismayed old men remain silent and refuse their suffrages; the strong party are none the less decided on the dissolution of the council: the only law is the will of the armed party; it becomes the government, and within three days the operation is demanded, obtained and consummated. All the rights of this government perish along with itself. All forms are effaced in blood. The power of election is transferred to a fresh committee: the electors constitute themselves magistrates.

“Violence upholds the work of violence. Eleven delegates are invested for two months with an extraordinary power, which has ruined almost all republics. This

* An old lady, mother of one of the principal nobility, was killed at her window by a musket-shot

tribunal is named a *Committee of security*: it is a dictatorship like that of Rome, and proud of the comparison. every citizen expects from it a similar result. Forestalling, therefore, all measures which might be taken by the powers allied to the Republic, they convert all the constitutionalists into so many prisoners of state. The gates of this city, full of wordy freedom, become to them those of a prison. Their persons, their families, their moveable property, are all placed under legal restriction. The twelve hostages, captives since the 8th April, serve as a safeguard and a pledge of impunity. During eighty-four days this system is pursued with a coolness and a quiet perseverance, no less astonishing than all the rest."

At this point of his narrative, Mallet depicts a characteristic which he perhaps believed peculiar to the dissensions of Geneva, but which since their time will not be found wanting in any of those revolutions of which it was the principal type in the eighteenth century. In reading what follows, in recognizing an anticipatory sketch of the French revolution in the characteristics which Mallet assigns to the revolution of Geneva in 1782, one may understand by what links the history of one of the smallest European cities is connected with that of the principal event of modern times. The revolutions of Geneva are like a foretaste of the revolution of 1789; a sort of rehearsal of the principal action, in a corner of the map at the entrance of France.

"But far more horrible excesses, vengeance more dreadful, a spirit incomparably more sanguinary, accompanied these changes. What Geneva had no precedent for, was a bravado of virtue united to criminal passions, des-

potism exercised over opinion by exacting a recognition of the propriety and justice of acts of monstrosity; the vaunting these as sacred duties; boasting their wisdom while lamenting their folly; invoking humanity though with blood-stained hands; writing phrases about 'country' while tearing its vitals, and citing the laws of nations while outraging the liberty of individuals.

"A scandalous oblivion of all decency, of all public morality, all respect for conscience, God, truth—a horri-fying symptom of incurable perversity, was at Geneva a maxim of State, and the best stock in trade of an author. The hypocrisy of vice is common enough, that of crime happily very rare: it is seldom met with amid the excesses of civil war, where energy is the great requisite. These produce tigers, but without endowing them with the qualities of apes; otherwise, they would become a scourge from which there would be no escape, and for which there would be no remedy. When an assassin murders you, he does not preface his crime by florid harangues on the safety of the highway; his truculent bearing warns you to stand on your guard; but how defend yourself from a man who vaunts his justice while threatening your life, and depriving you of your liberty? What is to become of a State when it contains tempters to whom good and evil are utterly indifferent, who reassure the conscience by transforming a contempt of law and of the rights of civil society into meritorious acts; and when fanatics infected with these doctrines, by conviction above all scruple, and rendered fit to undertake any crime by dint of sophistries and illusions?

"I will not do the Genevèse the injustice of attributing to all of them this atrocious Machiavelism:—far from it; but to this had the majority prostituted its credulity: and

many an honest citizen who, in the silence of his own home, would have felt his heart beat, and his mind recoil with horror from the sight of events now of every day occurrence, resumed his boldness and his frenzy on drinking in the poison commended to him in a pamphlet.

“The honourable practice of appealing to men through the press had ceased to produce in Geneva anything but insolence or gross paradoxes. The schoolboy, scarcely emancipated from the swaddling-clothes of ignorance, set to work to plagiarize axioms from Raynal, Rousseau, Montesquieu—mouthed generalities and philosophic jargon, turning them inside out, talking nonsense with an arrogance, an impudence, a mendacity, which yet rouses my indignation.

“This reflected falsehood, this mental gangrene which could only be cured by cauterizing, the sources of miseries to a people on whom heaven had bestowed an ample share of good-feeling, candour, and patriotism, makes me in my own despite, assume a tone of anger; but capable as I am of pardoning the most violent outrages I might receive, I would never forgive the cold-blooded impostor who should attempt to add strength to the arm that struck me by his phrases and his metaphors.”

Meanwhile, the tempest brooded over the revolutionary city: it was easy to conjecture that the neighbouring States would no longer hesitate to re-establish in the Republic a system consonant with their own interests. Different reasons made it equally important to Berne, to France, and to Savoy, that a period should be put to this anarchy.

“The discussions which to Geneva and to the eyes of Parisian philosophers might appear no more than a skirmish of wit and about liberty, seemed to rulers in whom reflection was a duty, a school of bare-faced revolt. It was but too obvious that these three sovereignties, without troubling themselves to calm down this riotous republic would at least aim at re-establishing there the disturbed political equilibrium, heedless of the evil their arrangements might create, so long as they were effected. The justification of such acts as these is not set down in the pamphlets of Geneva, or in the theories of metaphysical politicians ; but it is stamped on every page of history. Woe to that man who seeks another rule for the government of states !”

Ere long the Genevese beheld approaching their city an army of ten thousand men ; the soldiers of Savoy, under the command of General de la Marmora ; the Swiss led by the patrician Lentulus ; the French having at their head M. de Jaucourt, surrounded by a throng of brilliant volunteers, who quitted Versailles to take part in this pageant, by which they were to gain the credit of a campaign. If the Governments and the Genevese exiles had hoped that the first glimpse of an armed force would allay the disturbance and unclosethe city gates, they were deceived. That first moment was not devoted to fear : the intoxication was too complete to pass off in a moment. The approach of the three powers only stirred up national pride and heightened fanaticism. Preparations were made to repeat the defence of the Saguntines, whose language had already been adopted.

“ Call up before you the dreadful picture of a nation of artizans, impoverished by idleness, supported by fanaticism ; gay amidst the most imminent danger, heedless of the fate of themselves and of their families ; all day long occupied in admiring the cannons and the works, or in the uninterrupted practice of military exercises ; mistaking a warlike mania for heroism, lulled in a military intoxication, rushing with enthusiasm upon their own ruin. Every one was a soldier, an artilleryman, a statesman, or a commander. And this pitiable game was carried on for two whole months ! and it was to result in the admission into Geneva of ten thousand foreign soldiers without a blow being struck ! ”

Meanwhile, the despatches of the plenipotentiaries producing no effect, the troops assembled on the frontier abandon their cantonments and approach Geneva. Fanaticism increases ; and the sole reply made to the conciliatory and temperate representations of the plenipotentiaries is the proroguing of the Committee of Security, accompanied by an expression of thanks, conjuring them, *“ in the name of the Supreme Being, to continue steadfast in a cause which forms the glory of virtuous citizens.”* Notwithstanding this, the political chiefs who had hitherto remained cool, now began to tremble at their own situation, for their fate, far more than those of the hostages, was at stake on the issue of impending events : and they thought of M. de la Marmora to extricate themselves and the Republic from this perilous crisis. The character and manners of this noble man, esteemed by all parties, and full of a true interest for Geneva, overcame the proud obstinacy of the commissaries : they empowered Mallet du Pan with

certain representatives, to visit the head-quarters of the Savoyard General, and endeavour to mitigate a catastrophe whose approach filled them with alarm. Before setting off, Mallet had a long interview with Flournois, the one among the representative commissaries, in the soundness of whose views he most confided. The willing deputies returned reassured by the favourable language of the General, but convinced that the re-establishment of order must be consented to with a good grace, or that it would be enforced. Unhappily it was a hopeless undertaking to preach common sense to the more ardent commissaries, to a people intoxicated with pride, who expected to treat as a king with a king, and who were moreover persuaded that no cannon would be fired against those walls which their opponents desired to save, and that the combined army would recoil before the peril of twelve prisoners.

“After this vain attempt, defensive measures became at once more active and more terrible. In a moment the cathedral-church, and two houses which enclosed the level summit of the hill on which Geneva is situated, are turned into magazines of combustibles. Seven thousand pounds of powder are deposited in that abode where prayers are offered up to the God of peace; where the laws, liberty, and the magistracy, year by year are consecrated by the hands of the Republic. The two houses, seized without the consent of their absent owners, are similarly converted into two stores of ammunition; they are in no way isolated; it is enough to keep them in sight. Here then is almost an entire town devoted to destruction if chance or circumstance bring on the consummation. Let us cast a veil over this picture, and

kneel down before the Divinity ; let us thank Heaven that no desperate hand sprang the mine.”*

At length the summonses are brought from the three Generals, demanding entry into the town, engaging in no way to interfere with the liberty of the Republic, intimating only an order to the authors and abettors of the late appeal to arms, to leave Geneva within twenty-four hours, and at a distance of twenty leagues to await the sentence of the Republic regarding them. Mallet seems to consider that these one and twenty abettors were but ill selected. Several, he asserts, were notoriously unconnected with the riot, or had refused their vote to the revolutionary measures. Be this as it may, the summons was treated with the same contempt as all that preceded it.

“ While the syndics alone and unsolicited, beg the Generals to grant some delay, the burgesses, unanimous in their vote for resistance, caused the tocsin to be sounded, and the drums beaten, and soon all are under arms. By night the confusion had attained its height : women, children, old men, cripples—all were armed, all prepared themselves to destroy on the morrow their lives and their country. Vainly had the clergy mixed among the people to assuage their desperation ! This was no mock resistance ; and so the three Generals judged, for they allowed of a fresh delay, indispensable to them for the execution of works which till then they had deemed unnecessary.”

* “ A storm alone endangered them. The very night which followed this transport of powder, it thundered unceasingly during two hours, and one peal was just over the town. The transport was conducted with the most culpable negligence, and during excessively hot weather.”

At length the blockade of the town was completed on one side by the lake, and on the other by a trench excavated at the foot of that house of pleasure of Aristippus, where Voltaire had celebrated the eternal goddess :

“ L’âme des grands travaux, l’objet des nobles vœux,
La liberté ! . . . ”

“ And now there was no longer a middle course : the city must be saved, or by its fall involve all in its ruin. Most of the chiefs, supported by a certain number of the wiser citizens, who, discontented with what had been done hitherto, had reserved the strength of their opposition for the last moment, were on the side of prudence ; all the rest on that of desperation. How could the latter be disarmed, deceived, their confidence betrayed yet not be lost, and this tragedy of republican fanaticism conducted to a peaceable termination ? All delusions had vanished at the opening of the trench : no one any longer deceived himself as to the certainty of the danger.

“ Notwithstanding, at five o’clock on the evening of Monday, a hundred deputies resort to the Town-Hall, to bury there either the Republic, or the revolution of April. What a session ! They opened it by reading a memorial, stating, on the authority of the engineer of the works, the impracticability of holding out for more than a few hours. This truth is enlarged upon with as much energy and supported by as many proofs as if no one had ever dreamed of a defence. Not a doubt is cast on the necessity of submitting to three powers leagued against them. It is the strongest protest against the conduct heretofore pursued.

“ This apartment, whose carefully closed doors shut in

the destiny of the Republic, resounds with the most vehement reproaches, the most obstinate debates, and with furious personalities; and in the midst of this discord, they proceed to the vote. Whether it was the result of a change of mind (in which I shall never believe) or of an error of management in counting the suffrages, a majority of sixteen votes preserved a town whose existence was purchased at the cost of painful humiliations.

“ Still, however, it was necessary to conceal from the people this determination to preserve their life; to undeceive them regarding a concession of which the disgrace exasperated them, and to shelter the captives from their hardly-restrained fury. In that very hall, several of the deputies broke their swords—it seemed as if their indignation would possess all hearts. And to crown all, it was in the darkness of midnight that safety must be maintained until the dawn.

“ The council of safety had abdicated its authority. There no longer existed a government, a magistracy, or a civil or military police; in a word, there were no restraints legal or otherwise. Alarmed at the prospect of misfortunes yet to come, the ancient guardians of the confidence and power of the nation made all haste to abandon it to its fate.*

* “ From this charge we must exempt MM. Vernes, Soret and Chappuis, three persons whose absence was required by the powers, and who had left over night, as had also M. Flournois, a member of the Council of the Two-hundred, and of the Committee of Safety. This last-named personage remained alone in the town till the evening of the following day, not choosing to share the flight of his associates, but firmly awaiting the event. His well-known courage, of which this last act gave fresh evidence, precludes all suspicion.

“Meanwhile the announcement of a defection had spread in all quarters, causing equal rage and surprise. The most violent hastened through the town collecting the disbanded troops, caused the drum to be beaten, and went to the dwelling of the hostages, which happily had been vacated. But the springs were relaxed, the artillery unfit for use; there no longer existed chiefs, or union, or resources for holding out. Some broke their weapons or threw them into the river; others discharged them against the walls, and against that fatal Church whence their ruin might spring forth in an instant, and into which they were not allowed to penetrate. In their escape, the chiefs risked falling victims to a fanaticism of which they had foreseen the desperation.

“These rapid volleys were followed by utter discouragement; the crowd left the town to avoid contact with the new masters about to enter it.

“A few moments afterwards, Count de la Marmora, at the head of his army, ignorant whether the musket shots which he heard, and the cannon of the battery would not be turned against himself, entered the town by the gate of Savoy, without beat of drum, without pomp, like the pacificator of a mourning city. He himself traversed on foot various quarters of the town to reassure them. In the afternoon, the French and Swiss generals made their entry, which had been delayed by the breaking of a bridge, and

that weakness had prompted his vote for submission. Among the representatives there was not a stronger-headed, or more judicious man. Perhaps he only was in a condition to lead a party, because he set more store by the policy taught by facts, than by that found in books.

this city of the arts beheld its streets occupied by ten thousand fusiliers. Their admirable discipline preserved the conquered party from all outrage.

“From this moment Geneva became no longer recognizable. During some days nothing was visible but soldiers lounging on the pavement deserted by its native inhabitants, and an assemblage of foreigners met together to enjoy the spectacle of our misery.

“After this faithful account,” says Mallet, at the end of this summary, which he penned on the morrow of the events recorded, “it will be evident to all unbiassed judgments, that if this gulf, replete with every species of danger, was closed by an act of cowardice, the blame of such an act does not rest with the people. The courage they displayed does not merit applause, but cannot justly be questioned. And even had they shown timidity, what nation would have done otherwise in such a case? Let us pity men so blinded by fanaticism as to think themselves dishonoured by a wise action. Let us pity them for having listened so late to the voice of necessity! Let us lament over the national reputation; over so much punctilio and ceremony, which ended by consigning the country unconditionally to three armies. When the Phocéans refused to submit to the yoke, they did not put their trust in unavailing weapons; an old man enlightened their enthusiasm, and they retreated to Marseilles there to establish an asylum for liberty.

“It is a misfortune to the whole human race, when this idol of every noble heart is outraged by the hands of her very worshippers. The spirit of servitude takes occasion from their faults to blaspheme this divinity. Each abuse of her

power makes one slave in some corner of the world, and weariness of anarchy breeds disgust at freedom. Such excesses are therefore an offence against all nations, because they afford a pretext for arbitrary power.

“Republican factions end sooner or later in tyranny. Thus, when such enthusiasts as Price and Raynal, called by simpletons defenders of the nations, but whom I call their corrupters, come to stir up the dregs of the states and set them in a ferment; when they foment discontent and disquiet, legitimizing revolt by asserting the inalienable right to revolt, let us oppose them, not with words, but with experience. Let us disprove their incendiary sophistries on the grave of all those nations whom political zeal has involved in calamity. With the history of Geneva before our eyes, we shall see that liberty is invariably ruined by its endeavours after extension. A score of happy nations have received chains while seeking for a government free from abuses, and not one has found it.”

It is with these reflections, and while casting an uneasy and sorrowful gaze upon his country, that Mallet du Pan concludes a narrative whose every page gives evidence of a profound mind and a truly republican spirit. Alas! how many prophetic traits are contained in this striking sketch of the errors of democratic pride, and how many themes for the meditation of petty states!

There was need of great courage to pen such a narrative the day after the event. No sooner did it appear in the “*Annales politiques*,” than it occasioned vehement complaints from the ultras of both parties. A foreigner became the spokesman of the resentment of the vanquished—no other than Brissot himself.

Brissot de Warville, in the prosecution of one of his sentimental and political tours, happened to be at Lyons. At the first outcry of revolution in 1782, he hastened to Geneva, to rouse if necessary the spirit of the Genevese, in whom he was anxious to witness a transcript of the heroism of the citizens of Saguntum, and to admire by anticipation the glory of the republican government, which his ardent imagination already saw established in France. "On beholding," says he, "this brave people destined to death or slavery, tears came into my eyes; I could not restrain my indignation, and scarcely had forty-eight hours elapsed since my arrival in Geneva, when I found myself composing an address to its intrepid inhabitants, exhorting them to a vigorous defence. . . I sent my pamphlet to d'Ivernois, but when it was at the very point of publication, that catastrophe happened which led to the capitulation of Geneva."*

It was not long before he became the familiar companion of the principal representatives, and the bosom friend of Clavière; but Brissot was austere republican and sublime in his writings only, and the frivolity of his disposition could not greatly engage the confidence of his new friends. As to Mallet, he would not even risk an acquaintance with one whose character offered no attraction. "Mallet du Pan had been invited by Vernes to sup with us; but from suspicion or indifference he never came."†

The heroic catastrophe not taking place at once, Brissot quitted Geneva; but after the event, under pretence of

* "Mémoires de Brissot," v. II, p. 127.

† Ibid, v. II, p. 132.

raising his voice in favour of his friends, he thought proper to aid the republican cause by a record of Genevese affairs, coloured after his own fashion, and under the title of the "Philadelphien à Genève," he published a counter narrative to that of Mallet. Those letters of the pretended American are neither more nor less than a violent diatribe against the bold and veracious historian, a diatribe in which the spirit of contradiction vies with the feigned sensibility and declamatory shamelessness of the revolutionary *bel esprit*. Mallet, indignant, and strong in conscious integrity, had no difficulty in triumphantly refuting, in a reply full of feeling and vigour, the false allegations of his critic. He began by explaining his object in undertaking the narrative so odiously distorted :

"An unfavourable impression had been the universal result of this tame surrender. After threatening announcements, these very inglorious philosophers—these drawing-room Saguntines—these weak-nerved women—these long-winded heroes, at Paris, at London, in Switzerland, awaited in the arms of their mistresses the ruin of Geneva : they had hoped to have it to prate of in their *boudoirs* and at their *petits soupers*. Indignant at the disappointment of their expectations, these would-be republicans called scorn of their exhortations cowardice. I proved, by an authentic narrative, that the people had been brave to the last, and that their leaders had acted right in ceasing to be so. In clearing them from this apparent stain, and these dishonouring prejudices spread throughout Europe, I confirmed the sympathy to which they are in all respects entitled."

"The Philadelphian," having hinted that the author of

the summary was stimulated by private resentment against some of the proscribed representatives, Mallet exclaims: "How do you know it? Do not invoke these exiles as accomplices in your imposture. I defy you to point out one among those with whom I have had personal dissension, and who injured me, and whom I might have injured, towards whom I ever neglected those acts of civility which are due even to such as differ from us in opinion—civilities unheard of at Geneva, but always practised by me."

He concludes with an apostrophe which passes judgment by anticipation on revolutionary philosophy.

"Philosopher as you call yourself, you end your tirade by accusing me of hating and attacking philosophers. I would not be guilty of such injustice against a Locke, a d'Aguesseau, a Montesquieu, a Voltaire, (when they lay no claim to the title of theologians); against a Thomas, a Buffon, a J. J. Rousseau. . . Allow me to treat with less ceremony a scribbling herd of headlong reformers, overturners of thrones, tribunals and altars; men who render that truth odious, which to be productive of good should be lovingly recommended; who carry excess into everything—intoxicated semi-politicians, born to precipitate the ruin of philosophy, of morals, of due subordination, and of liberty."

The fact is, that by writing his letters of a "Philadelphian," Brissot had officiously played a part which no one had assigned to him, and for which perhaps nobody, with the exception of Clavière, thanked him. In his "*Mémoires*" he dolefully charges his Genevese friends with ingratitude. "The vanquished would hardly acknowledge themselves indebted to me for the work I published in their

favour, and which I have already alluded to under the title of the ‘*Philadelphien à Genève*.’ I had neither materials, nor recompense. Virchaux printed the work, circulated it, appropriated it—and all I got for my trouble was a violent satire by Mallet du Pan.” Elsewhere, Brissot says that Mallet attacked him without provocation: we know now how far we may depend on the veracity of Brissot’s repeated assertions of innocence which meet us at every turn in his “*Mémoires*.” He adds this calumny: “To push off his ‘*Annales*,’ Mallet was fain to flatter the prime minister, and successfully paid his court, by slandering me as well as his persecuted countrymen. I fortified myself against insult as well as against ingratitude; I had attained my aim, which was to be useful in accelerating the triumph of liberty.”

CHAPTER IV.

1784—1789.

Mallet du Pan quits Geneva and goes to Paris—The “*Mercure de France*”—M. Panckoucke intrusts to Mallet the political part of the “*Mercure*”—Revolution in Holland, and contention between Mallet and the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Mirabeau: “*Analyse des papiers anglais*”—News from England—Trial of Warren Hastings—Rage of Mirabeau and Brissot.

THE “*Annales*,” as well as the “*Mémoires*,” of Mallet du Pan have been forgotten; the six volumes of literary and political criticism fused into the collection of Linguet’s journals, have shared the same fate. Scandal flourishes but for a season, the fame that is built on it perishes with its downfall. Linguet, who preferred such evanescent success to more solid honour, which might have been the reward of a better use of his superior intellect, hastened his ruin by filling his pages with his wearisome self-display; the person of the hero was not interesting, nor his pen powerful enough to keep alive the remembrance of his quarrels and grievances. Though an occasional glance at the “*Journal de Paris*” and the first numbers of the “*Annales*” may prove satisfactory to those who are curious to recall the doings of the already distant eighteenth century,

yet the superficiality of these works may account for the oblivion into which they have fallen. Such parts, however, as were contributed by Mallet du Pan are worthy of being exempted from the fate which a similarity of title in his journal has caused him to share. I cannot point out any contemporary summary in which a better considered notification of the events of those years of the eighteenth century, with their true political and moral bearing, can be found.

Notwithstanding his unbending opposition to the current of fashionable ideas, Mallet met with serious and attentive readers of his periodical publication. A translation was published at Florence; and two counterfeits appeared, one in Switzerland, the other in the Netherlands. His plain speaking opposed a barrier to the entrance of his writings into France, yet they circulated there, and procured for their author the reputation of a distinguished journalist, and before long, led to proposals which influenced the future prospects of Mallet du Pan.

The Editor of the "Encyclopédie," M. Panckoucke, who had for several years (1778) edited the "Mercure de France," formed the idea of uniting to this compendium the political journal which he published every week under the twofold title of "Journal de Bruxelles" and "Journal historique et politique de Genève." At the same time he cast his eyes on Mallet for the management of the latter paper, which till then had been edited by M. de Fontanelle. Mallet, still sore from the rancour and attacks of various kinds which his summary of the events of the preceding year had drawn down upon him, was sick of Genevese politics. Moreover, his republican feel-

ings were harassed by the unhappy state of his country, occupied by foreign troops, a prey to luxury and *fêtes*, in which it was sought to stifle the memory of hatred and dissension. "The face of the country has undergone too great a change," he writes to Sir Samuel Romilly, "for us to become inured to the alteration." He responded to the honourable appeal addressed to his talents and his eminence as a journalist. In the summer of 1783, he suspended the publication of the "*Mémoires politiques*," and went to Paris with his family at the age of thirty-five. Extensive reading, a habit of meditating on politics, a singular and profound acquaintance with the situation of the European States; ten years passed in the midst of the passions and contest of parties, had hurried forward the maturity of his intellect; indeed, he was one of those grave and strong-minded men whose age one never thinks of enquiring. No sooner was the "*Mercure*" in his hands than Panckoucke applauded his own discernment, and an agreement, entered into in March, 1784, secured to him the co-operation of Mallet du Pan, on conditions sufficiently indicative of the value attached to his services.* A word as to the "*Mercure*."

The "*Mercure de France*" as regarded its two parts, one literary, the other political, although assigned to

* According to this contract, dated the 4th of March, 1784, Panckoucke, proprietor by virtue of ministerial acts of the "*Journaux de Genève et de Bruxelles*," commissions Mallet du Pan to compose and supervise the "*Journal historique et politique de Genève*," which was published every Saturday, and empowered him, according to custom, to form from it the "*Journal politique*," entitled "*de Bruxelles*," in union with the "*Mercure*," and to

Panckoucke, remained under the control of the Government, who audited the accompts, and even gave pensions apportioned to the profits of the journal. The literary portion, into which since 1778 the "*Jouŕnal de Littérature*" had been incorporated, numbered among its editors, Marmontel, Suard, La Harpe, Imbert, Lacroŕelle, Garat, Naigeon, Saint-Ange, Champfort, &c. It was more especially what at the present day would be called a literary review, edited with talent and judgment, and receiving successively from its enterprising manager the addition of the "*Journal des Dames*" and the "*Journal des Spectacles*." The real "*Mercure*" itself may be tracked through the midst of theatrical news, and advertisements of every description, a profusion of verses, charades, enigmas, logographs, received from the provinces, and reverting to them as material for their favourite amusements. As to the political "*Mercure*" it was condemned to be merely a gazette, and indeed a gazette out of favour till the assembling of the Estates General. The task of the editor was to epitomize the political events of each week: regarding those of the interior, he was to limit himself to a succinct relation of official facts, without comment. On the subject of foreign affairs he was more at liberty,* except when the minister had some knotty intrigue to conceal, or some claim to be ratified by public

pearing on Saturday. In return, he engages to pay him seven thousand two hundred livres a-year. The editor had, moreover, twelve hundred livres for the articles he furnished to the literary department.

* Still, the privilege of first announcing important news belonged to the "*Gazette de France*."

opinion. In such a case the task became a most delicate one for a man, like Mallet du Pan, incapable of changing his opinion according to order. It was thus that the troubles in Holland, tampered with a long while by M. de Vergennes, gave rise to positive dissension between our editor and the minister, in whose department he laboured as a subordinate.

This minister was M. de Montmorin, who after the death of M. de Vergennes carried on the policy pursued by the latter in fostering the discord in Holland. It is well known, that in 1786 an insurrection broke out in the Netherlands, and that the Prince of Orange, the Hereditary Stadtholder, being deposed from his post of commander-in-chief, was forced to fly. This was the work of the democratic faction and the French Government, who took an active part in favour of the democrats, in hopes of contracting a close alliance with Holland, and so dictating its policy. No pains were spared to effect this object. The Emperor demanded an indemnity, which France paid: they signed a treaty of alliance, securing its rights to the neutral party; they even went farther than this. As a set-off against the influence of England and Prussia, which was employed to re-establish the authority of the Stadtholder, they devised no better expedient than to excite the revolutionary zeal of the patriots. The French Ambassador, the Duke of La Vauguyon, encouraged the chiefs of the popular party, in the most imprudent manner.* Mallet foresaw the result of this rash and unprincipled policy: he suspected what eventually

* "Notice sur M. le Comte de Saint-Priest," par M. de Barante. Paris, Amyot. 1848.

became evident, that by not allowing the exhausted prerogatives of the Stadtholderate to die away of themselves, everything needful was being done for their complete re-establishment. He considered that by means of violence, of arbitrary cassations, of intemperate deliberations, of contempt for all laws and all rights, they would but induce the rulers and the majority of the States General to espouse the cause of the Stadtholder; and that both parties, driven to extremity, and openly attacked, would not vainly invoke aid from the King of Prussia; that a little sense on the part of the pretended patriots would disarm that monarch even of his own despite; while, as actually happened, hostile attempts must compel him to interfere, without enabling the French Government, though every way urged on to a troublesome war, to dream of drawing the sword.

For these reasons, the Editor of the "*Mercure politique*" carefully abstained from applauding these democratic acts of violence, which provoked Prussian interference in so imprudent a manner. He had taken care to make known that he took no part in the publication of such extracts from gazettes of the Low Countries as were inserted in his newspaper; "articles," he added, "loaded with palpable falsehoods which it was not his office to point out." His censor struck out this last sentence, and in the same way suppressed half his article on the year 1786. Not liking that the Stadtholder should be Prince of Orange, he three times substituted the word of Nassau for Orange, while Mallet steadily refused to share in these official falsifications, and as to the gazettes despatched by M. de Koy and from the Hague, whether he had been

sent. "It would indeed be a wonder," Mallet replied to the minister, "if there were only one correct view of the interest of France, and if M. de Rayneval had hit on it." At last it gave umbrage at Versailles that the Editor of the "*Mercure*" should be so unwilling to *oblige* (allow himself to be made a tool of). He was threatened with being deprived of the editorship of the journal, and perhaps with something worse. In this critical situation, he addressed to M. de Montmorin the following letter:

"History, my Lord, must have convinced you, like myself, that as the liberty of a commonwealth resides in its laws, all attempts to reform these by force of arms, must plunge the state into anarchy. The right which one faction or body of citizens claims to-day of overturning by force the established order of things, to-morrow may be usurped with equal justice by another faction or body of citizens. No state has ever yet survived this species of corruption; and I foresee that it will ruin Holland also. If, under pretext of a hazardous endeavour after perfection, or of customs abolished centuries ago, the people might trifle with Governments established and maintained without tyranny; might, at the point of the bayonet, overturn or set up rule; might arbitrarily dismiss irapproachable magistrates; substitute might for right, and dispute with the sovereign even that legitimate authority confided to him by themselves, all social order, all security, all stability would disappear. Is it then prudent or reasonable to represent these deeds of a riotous democracy as the expression of a lawful and really general choice? Political conjunctures may sometimes justify a

ruler in closing his eyes for the moment to these truths, but such conjunctures pass by: only the rights of legitimate sovereigns and of nations, mutually limited by the bond of law, remain sacred and inalienable."

What was M. de Montmorin's conduct on reading this bold letter? Mallet informs us that M. de Montmorin was not offended either by his resistance, or by his remarks, then considered as the height of daring. "Another minister," says he, "would probably have sent me in answer a *lettre de cachet*."

This dispute over between the journalist and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. de Montmorin gave Mallet a fresh proof of his equity and esteem for him; and the grateful journalist remembered this, when, some years later, (in 1791,) Louis XVI. was forced to sacrifice his minister and his friend to the unpopularity that waits on power. "Soon after the revolution, or rather the counter-revolution in Holland," says Mallet, "some vagabond Frenchmen who received pay in that country for pamphlets directed against the Prince and Princess of Orange, driven thence by fear and the Prussian hussars, returned upon the hands of Government; they united with Mirabeau to deprive me of the 'Mercure,' and possess themselves of it. They wearied the foreign department with horrible falsehoods against me; they—especially Mirabeau—represented me as an outrageous Anglo-maniac, a traitor to the Government, in writing contrary to its views. The interest of the ministers demanded that they should wrest the pen from my hands, to place it in those of Mirabeau and his associates. These manœuvres miscarried before the justice of the minister: he was not influenced by the preju-

dices suggested to him, and respected my property. I am gratified at being able to express publicly my obligation to him at a time when he is no longer in office.”*

This allusion to Mirabeau was grounded on more than mere suspicion. Mirabeau, seeing that the direction of the “*Mercure*” was evidently escaping him, obtained from the minister authority to publish a paper, in which, under the somewhat inappropriate title of “*Analyse des papiers Anglais*,” he enlarged on the politics of the whole of Europe, in spite of the remonstrances of Panckoucke, who protested against this infringement of his privilege. In his “*Analyse*,” Mirabeau, who attributed to Mallet the failure of the Dutch revolution, lost no opportunity of attacking him, and broadly accused him of betraying the Government “whose wages he received.”†

M. de Montmorin let Mirabeau have his way. Nevertheless, his clerks and the censors interfered with the editorship of Mallet, and mangled his productions outrageously; although they complained of the “*Mercure*” none the less, as soon as the moment came, unexpectedly to them, when, the patriots demanding the despatch of an army, it was proved to the ministers that they were not in a condition to form a camp of thirty thousand men at Givet, and impede the entry of the Prussians into Holland, nor to arrest the revolution which followed to the benefit of the Stadtholder.

I find among Mallet’s manuscripts, the following conversation which he held on this subject with a chief clerk

* “*Mercure de France*,” 1791, No. 49.

† See the “*Analyse des papiers anglais*,” 1788, Nos. 30, 31, 38, &c.

of the foreign office: it is not wanting in vigour or insight into the French diplomacy of this period.

THE CLERK. Our policy is sometimes secret—it is never deceptive. We had no desire of destroying the Stadtholder, but we could not allow him to be the commonwealth.

MALLET. On that supposition, would you have had it in your power to restrain the party which you had supplied with arms; which had expelled him from the Hague; which had suspended him from his functions?

THE CLERK. We should have managed that.

MALLET. It was much to expect.

THE CLERK. It was not the Court of England nor Prussia which brought on the revolution.

MALLET. To whom then is it to be attributed?

THE CLERK. To Madame Dankelman, Maid of Honour to the Princess of Orange, who excited the King of Prussia—a thorough crackbrain.

MALLET. But then she must have kept him in excitement three months together, during which his army was marching, encamping; his despatches being addressed in succession to the Dutch States; his vengeance threatened?

THE CLERK. I tell you, it was Madame Dankelman who did the job; there are things we know, and you cannot. It was she and the Duke of Brunswick. The King of Prussia's friends, Mollendorf and others, regretted the undertaking.

MALLET. That appears extraordinary to me.

THE CLERK. We were on very good terms, when, all at once, he took this into his head. You ran counter to us in appearing to take the part of the Stadtholder: for

seeing that, in a recognized organ of the Government, they fancied at Berlin that we had no real intention of backing the patriots. Thus you played against us.

MALLET. I should not have believed in such great effects from such slight causes.

THE CLERK. No, indeed ; but it is as I say. But, in fact, it was Marshal de Ségur who spoiled the affair, by telling the King that a camp of twenty-four thousand men at Givet would cost eight millions. Had these been only twelve thousand, the Prussians would never have dared enter Holland.

MALLET. That economy was unlucky.

THE CLERK. But Rayneval was right in telling you that England had no share in the revolution. Pitt did not dare tell the Parliament so, and, if he had said it, the opposition would have given him the lie.

MALLET. Yet the King of England borrowed on his own account £250,000 sterling, which he sent to the Prince of Orange : the nation took arms to prevent you from obstructing the revolution organized by the Prussians.

THE CLERK. Yes ; but they did not produce the revolution. Besides, you must not rely on Rayneval's expressions : he does not know the value of words, and can't write. He writes that the English had no more share in it than the "Great Mogul," as when he wrote to M. de Goërtz : "The Princess of Orange knows that that is *the law and the prophets*."

MALLET. I understand.

THE CLERK. He managed his negotiation at the Hague badly. The King had nominated me to it ; he chose to

go. I would have passed by way of Nimèguen and seen the Stadtholder first of all. One ought to know States before interfering with them; hear both sides; put no one in alarm," &c.

The "Mercure" had not frustrated the policy of Versailles; but Versailles had made the mistake of undertaking, without the power of sustaining it, a difficult part, as imprudent as its moral bearing was questionable. It is not the business of governments to foment revolutions, and, when they engage in the task, events are sure to make them repent it sooner or later.

"Versailles is in consternation," wrote Mallet in his private memoranda, "at the revolution in Holland, which comes upon them altogether unforeseen by the clerks or their chiefs. M. de Maillebois, who is here, has been summoned to a cabinet council; at which he begged the ministers to re-peruse his correspondence of the last six months, and see whether he had not forewarned them, and concluded by telling them that all was over, and there was nothing more to be attempted. The detestable advices they received from Holland, and their illusion as to the strength of the cabal, lulled them into this security, and made them fancy that, with violence, illegality, and adventurers, things would manage themselves. These adventurers, sent down thither, paid by this court, paid in Holland, found the trade a good one; and, in order to prolong their commission, were incessantly exaggerating the resources, the numbers, the triumph, of the faction, and recommending violent measures. Such were the men whose advice prevailed over that of sound-thinking persons; such was the upshot of sixty millions lavished

hence—as much on the side of Holland—and of six years labour, intrigues, and manceuvres.

“What an outpouring here of idiotic folly concerning the Dutch revolution. The King of Prussia is a brigand; he pillages Holland, bombards Amsterdam; the Stadtholder will be supreme, liberty annihilated, &c. Assail this nonsense, and the gazettes of Amsterdam and Leyden are quoted against you. It is impossible to reason with any one on this matter, or to see it in a more distorted light. It all comes to this; we don’t like the revolution—therefore it is unjust, atrocious: the Prince of Orange is no friend to us; therefore he is in the wrong.”

Thus Mallet, for having seen too truly, found himself exposed on the one hand to the ill-humour of the Government, and on the other to the fierce tirades of the Dutch patriots and their French friends, who treated him as an enemy of liberty and of republics, whilst the “*Journal de Paris*” accused him of having spoken of monarchical states with the most sovereign contempt.

These vexations, these attacks on both sides, may furnish some idea of the obstacles which the journalist encountered in his labours; they show also what conscientiousness he brought to his task. Mallet wrote his weekly political article not like an hack-writer, but like an historian; he collected all the documents which an extensive correspondence could procure, and whose value and conclusions it was the more necessary to estimate and scrutinize; a delicate task, in which he did not relax a single day, thus offering an example of that probity which is the virtue and should be the honour of journalists.

Notwithstanding the brevity of his narratives, Mallet possessed the ever rare talent of philosophically throwing light on facts, and showing their course and connexion, in remarks as summary as the text, but which roused reflection. It is especially in the articles on English affairs that the political sagacity of Mallet du Pan may be appreciated. As a series, they may be truly said to constitute annals of Great Britain, not only exact, but animated, dramatic, and philosophic, in a high degree, at one of the most singular periods of its history. "A spectacle," he says, "truly astonishing, and worthy the attention of observers, is offered by the efforts of all kinds made by Great Britain to strengthen the levers of its power, and establish those of its prosperity." The proceedings of Parliament which attested this energy, appeared to him deserving of the attention of all thinking minds; and it must be admitted that he summoned his French readers to the most salutary study that could have been proposed to them in those times of political regeneration.

The parliamentary history of Great Britain presents in the interval between the years 1786 and 1788 a famous episode, the commencement of the proceedings against Warren Hastings. The "*Mercur*" is undoubtedly the most authentic and the most curious, or rather the only one that can be consulted upon this affair, the first stages of which it recounts with the most lively interest.

Of the same nature as the recall of Dupleix, the prosecution and execution of Lally, this protracted and rancorous persecution of the ex-Governor-General of Bengal was, independently of intrigue and personal interest, instigated,

and as it were necessitated by that species of secret jealousy of authority and ministers, which in the eighteenth century universally dominated over opinion. Unable as yet to attack the monarchs of Europe, they exercised their despotism upon those absolutely powerful officers, who governed for them in the remote colonies. In England the influence was more direct: the House of Commons could not look without distrust upon their acquisition in India, of the position of actual sovereigns, who dispensed the immense treasures and greater authority which they always believed, and sometimes averred to be disposed to disown their prerogative. Moreover, ambition as well as parliamentary eloquence found it advantageous to arraign these powerful governors before its tribunal. It was, therefore, impossible for them—necessarily invested with a vast power—established in their position specially for the purpose of extending the possessions of the mother country—to execute their mission without ever infringing justice, humanity, and a legality, which indeed was not established. Sometimes, subject to the most terrible alternatives, frequently compelled to conquer in order to preserve—to prevent at any cost the defections, the dangerous alliances of other Asiatic sovereigns, they took the aggressive initiative, the consequences of which were not entirely under their control, nor in themselves altogether irreprehensible. These acts, frequently arbitrary, and violent, and whose necessity was not always evident, were enormously exaggerated by the unscrupulous reports of the envious and ill-disposed; and the imagination of the factious embellished at its will this ground-work of accusation with frightful crimes, and all the transgressions of despotism.

Such is the history of Warren Hastings. It was after having been appointed Governor-General of India by the Company, and supported fourteen years by the voice of the Parliament, even at the time of that terrible crisis which appeared to menace England with final ruin—it was when by dint of intelligence, and with the resources of the Company alone, without receiving a single guinea from the metropolis, that he had succeeded in defending the English possessions in India against the confederate powers of India and France; it was even at the moment in which Great Britain consoled herself for the loss of America by rejoicing in the certain possession of India, the most brilliant jewel in her crown—it was now that this gifted* administrator was, in his turn, denounced by his fellow citizens as a monster worthy of every species of punishment, and of utter abhorrence.

Concocted even in the Council of Bengal itself, in which the Governor had envious rivals, and one mortal enemy, this blow impended for four years before it fell upon him. Burke, excited by the accounts and private communications of Francis, seized with his usual impetuosity upon the

* It is worthy of recollection that we owe to Hastings our knowledge of the first fragment published of the "Mahabarat." The "Mercure" of February, 1786, observes: "Mr. Hastings and the East India Company have rendered an eminent service to history and philosophy, by giving to the public, under their authority, a work entitled, 'The Bhagavat-Gœta.' This curious literary monument of the literature, mythology, and morals of the ancient Hindoos, is itself an extract from the 'Mahabarat,' a poem of considerable length, which is said to have been written more than four thousand years ago, and which the Brahmins of the present day regard as the treasury of all the mysteries of their religion."

brilliant career which was opened to him : he determined to be the Cicero of this Verres, and without waiting for the complaints from India, he entered Parliament as the vindicator of this second Sicily. He was heard at every Session, supported by the other chiefs of his faction, and all the enemies the Governor of India had made, accusing the latter in general terms of having embezzled the public money, of oppression, of disobedience to the orders of the Company, and to those of Parliament. The opposite party replied by representing Hastings as the greatest man England had ever possessed. The opinion of the Government oscillated between this admiration and these alleged outrages ; while the man, who was their object, rested tranquilly in the midst of the empire which he governed, with a sustained ascendancy viewing the successive arrival of each monsoon of contradictory despatches—overwhelmed with reproaches in one, and lauded in another. At last, when called upon by the public voice, he went to England personally to confront his adversaries and to insist upon his trial. Burke, compelled to relinquish his generalities, resolved upon demanding the regular prosecution of Warren Hastings.

From among the methods of prosecution which in accordance with the constitution were available, he chose the most rigorous, that of impeachment, a decree of accusation laid before the House of Lords on the demand of the Commons. It was, therefore, necessary to obtain from the Commons a decree of impeachment. On the 17th of February, 1786, Burke made his motion on the ground of the investigations of a Committee of Inquiry formed some time since, and this demand became

the subject of a long and violent discussion—the first stage of this famous trial.

The ministry and Mr. Pitt gave their support to the opposition; Mr. Pitt toned down the violence of the speeches of his eloquent adversaries, Fox, Burke and Sheridan, but finally voted with them in favour of the impeachment: Lord North, who had lost America, attached himself to the most violent persecutors of the man who had preserved India, while the demagogue Wilkes rose with Admiral Hood to brand this persecution with infamy.

Mallet du Pan, an attentive and studious observer of what passed in England, did not fail to communicate to his readers the curiosity and interest which this affair inspired in himself. From the commencement, to his clear-sighted judgment, the weakness of the proofs of the accusation was evidently perceptible through the eloquence of the accusers. He was especially struck with the inconsistency of prosecuting as criminal those faults which were profitable to the State, without demanding that the State should relinquish the advantages so acquired. But he was truly indignant when he saw that in France, as in England, public opinion became excited upon partial and incomplete statements, and that they condemned the accused without appeal before having heard his defence. Under whatever form oppression presented itself to him, Mallet was always ready to ally himself with an ill-treated minority. In vain Mr. Fox, for whom he possessed an avowed partiality, because he considered him to be a true statesman, had spoken for three hours “with much eloquence and animosity, much exaggeration and plausibility of argument;” in vain

Sheridan, in a speech of five hours, which did not allow the attention of the audience to wander for an instant, "had produced the wonderful effects of popular eloquence in the ancient Republics ;"* nothing was sufficient to deceive him as to the foundation of the trial, and when the impeachment was decided upon, he wrote :

" This event gives rise to a reflection. Among the numerous accusations of which Mr. Hastings has been the object, there is not one which attributes to him peculation, spoliation, or unjust acquisition of wealth. Clerks have returned from India more opulent than he has, and although undoubtedly guilty of the most horrible exactions, no one has dreamt of involving them in a prosecution. We have seen Lord Clive, Rumbold and others, accused of crimes, malversations and pillages, the most clearly proved—even held in detestation throughout India—cited before the House of Commons and acquitted. It is, therefore, very strange that their tardy severity should be exerted now upon a man upon whom they can cast no other reproach than that of having too well served the State by measures politic, although perhaps unjust and violent, but which had not in any respect the personal interest of the defendant as their object. . . .

" Mr. Hastings may undoubtedly appear reprehensible in the eyes of strangers, even to individuals among the well-informed ; but it is very extraordinary that a nation usurping a part of India, should take upon itself to intermix the rules of morality with those of an administration essentially of force, injustice and violence, and which, in order to be consistent, it ought for ever to renounce."

* " *Mercure*," 1787, No. 2.

The Constitution and custom of England have surrounded with great solemnity the exercise of this remarkable prerogative of the Parliament, which subjects the accused of the highest rank to a public examination of their conduct, and to punishment, if they are guilty. Upon the day fixed for the ceremony of opening the prosecution, the Commons adjourned to the great Hall at Westminster, preceded by the managers of the accusations, Mr. Burke at their head. The peers, having afterwards entered in procession, the late Governor of Bengal, clothed in dark blue cloth, came forward accompanied by his counsel, and the serjeant-at-arms delivered him into the custody of the usher of the black rod, after which the accused knelt down for an instant before the bar. Hastings had had only three days to reply in writing to the two hundred and eighty folio pages of the impeachment, preferred by the Commissioners of the Commons deputed to conduct the trial, Messrs. Fox, Burke, Sheridan, Grey, Colonel North, &c., and he was obliged to divide this task among his friends, who laboured with him night and day. In the violence with which the principal managers were animated, for the vanity of the three illustrious orators of the Opposition was enlisted in the debate, they raised with reference to the rights of the accused, as such distinctions little in conformity with the liberal principles of which they should have been the principal supporters. When, ultimately, they entered upon the accusation their animosity was equal to the talent they displayed. Nothing ever exceeded the virulence, the passion, and the impetuosity of these speeches delivered in the presence and at a few paces from the defendant, a man of less

stature, with grey hair and a venerable aspect, sustaining with a calm and untroubled aspect the intense curiosity of an immense assembly, which included all the illustrious personages in England.*

All this pompous show and violence of opinion, designed to ruin a man prostrate before the seat of justice, inspired in Mallet a resolution as generous as it was ill-calculated to maintain his popularity. Mr. Hastings was informed by a common friend, that if he could communicate to M. Mallet du Pan, notes and explanatory statements which would tend to enlighten men's opinion, and to lead just and moderate men to form more sound ideas upon the accusations which were brought against him, the author of the "Mercure" would be happy to make them public.

The ex-Governor was profoundly sensible of this interest, which he had not expected from a stranger, and which certainly was of importance in the isolated position of the defendant, when opinion, carried away, or intimidated by the eloquence of the great orators of the Opposition, had finally abandoned the accused, and the few solitary friends who gave him their support. He therefore transmitted to Mallet such documents as were adapted to enlighten the French public who were furiously opposed to him, and the journalist made use of them in the commentaries with which he accompanied either his analysis, or the text itself of the speeches of Fox and Sheridan.

As long as they restricted themselves to the generalities of political morals, and did not go beyond sketching in

* On the days when Sheridan delivered his harangues upon the conduct of Hastings towards the begums, or princesses of Oude tickets of admission were sold for as much as thirty guineas.

their masterly style the crimes by which, according to their account, the administration of Hastings had horrified India, the orators were constantly at the level of their great renown; but when it at last became necessary to support the effects of eloquence by positive proofs, the fall was truly strange, and it became astonishing to see in such an investigation of a thirty years' administration, by the Governor-General of a great empire, that, instead of treating great political questions, examining financial administration, decrees issued and alliances formed, the managers consumed the time of the Court by inquiries sometimes puerile, upon the genuineness of a copy, or in a subtle cross-examination.

The trial had lasted four months; still they had only treated of the first two of the twenty charges of the accusation, and the witnesses for the defence had not yet been called; it was demanded on all sides when this trial would be concluded. Mallet, for his part, replied:

“No one can say with certainty; we merely repeat what we said two years ago, which cannot now escape any observer of penetration, that the enemies of Mr. Hastings defer his defence and his sentence, by the inexhaustible resources which a case of that kind presents. It would have been decided already, if they had proceeded with a sincere intention of hastening the day of pronouncing judgment; but the addresses of five hours on a single clause, preceded by others, two sittings long, all upon the same clause, and a brief of a thousand pages folio* upon the first charge, promise to carry the *dénouement* of this scene into the

* “Analyse des papiers anglais,” 1788, No. 30.

next century. In awaiting its issue, the accused remains exposed to the most grievous defamation; his torment is prolonged from week to week, from month to month, from year to year; and scarcely is the poison-cup exhausted, which they pour upon his bleeding wounds, when they reunite their forces to replenish it, devoting their victim to receive in the interval and in silence, all the stabs of prejudice, of malignity, of mercenary impudence and public levity."

The generous part which Mallet's conscience imposed upon him excited violent rage; Clavière and Brissot wrote a pamphlet against him on this occasion, full of invectives; and Mirabeau himself, not content with giving play to all the whimsicality of his romantic invention, at the expense of Hastings, did not hesitate to insinuate that an individual so rich as the ex-Governor of Bengal, and known to have bought more than one writer, might also have bought the editor of the "*Mercur*."*

* This insinuation was probably made by Brissot, and not by Mirabeau. The following passage in Brissot's "*Memoirs*" countenances this supposition to a certain extent. "Mirabeau contemplated the publication of a paper under the title of '*Analyse des papiers anglais*.' This was a cloak under which he circulated daring truths among the public; but unfortunately he knew neither the English language nor the state of England. I offered of my own accord to assist him in this respect, and he accepted with his usual courtesy. Daring in attack, he had violent disputes with Mallet du Pan on the trial of Hastings, and the position of the English in the East Indies; and my studies on this subject were of service to him. I also wrote several letters against Mallet, which have been published under the name of Mirabeau. I must do justice to our adversary: he was well acquainted with history, familiar with

We shall dispense with entering into any refutation of similar conjectures ; but it may be profitable to show that Mallet du Pan was not even the dupe of a generous illusion. Hastings did not correspond in any respect to the idea which had been formed of him upon the evidence of his accusers. See what a friend had communicated to Mallet with reference to him :

“Hastings never forgets a favour or an injury. Generous, a warm friend, a vindictive enemy, burning with zeal for the glory of his country, violent in his feelings, modest, simple and even timid at home and in society, but powerful and intrepid in his cabinet ; confident of his innocence, full of a sense of the services which he has rendered, braving all considerations and infusing into his defence that fearless impetuosity which appals his persecutors, he has said publicly that his condemnation would be the last service he should render to his country in proving to it that a minister (Mr. Pitt), is capable of sacrificing the interests of the State, its best servants, and the wishes of the King, to a desire to conciliate the Opposition, and to carry his motions through Parliament. The interest of life is nothing to Mr. Hastings, that of the State and its honour absorbs him entirely. It is not only his acquittal which he seeks for—he goes much farther ; and he will not consider full justice is done to him until the two Houses pass a vote of thanks to him, until the East India Company accord to him the customary pension, and the Court a peerage.”

the subjects on which he wrote, whereas Mirabeau was totally deficient in study, although some of his works are overloaded with the notes of a scholar.” *Mémoires de Brissot*, v. ii. p. 385.

If it had been proved that Mr. Hastings was guilty of the acts of inhumanity and of violence which were imputed to him, and that he had been carried away by motives of cupidity, ambition, or personal resentment, not only would he not have been reinstalled, as he was in 1795, in the position of Privy Councillor, and received at Court,* but especially he would not have commanded up to his death, in a country such as England, the esteem and attachment of men remarkable for their political probity, their virtue, and the independence of their character. A person who had conversed upon this trial more than once with Lord Teignmouth, appointed Governor of India after the administration of Mr. Hastings, has told us that this man, religious, humane and universally esteemed, had taken advantage of his authority to collect upon the spot positive evidence of the deeds attributed to the Governor of Bengal.

* "An illustrious historian, Mr. Macaulay, in his 'Essay' upon Hastings, states that in 1813 the ex-Governor General of Bengal was summoned once more to the bar of the House of Commons; but on this occasion to be heard in evidence relative to the East India Company, the renewal of whose Charter was under deliberation. He reappeared on that same spot where he had seen Burke deposit on the table of the House the heads of accusation.

"Since that time, twenty seven years had elapsed; public feeling had undergone a complete change; the nation had now forgotten his faults, and only remembered his services. The reappearance, too, of a man who had been among the most distinguished of a generation that had passed away, who now belonged to history, and who seemed to have risen from the dead, could not but produce a solemn and pathetic effect. The Commons received him with acclamations ordered a chair to be set for him, and when he retired, rose and uncovered."

He had had among others frequent interviews with the Begum of Oude, and his decisive opinion upon the character and conduct of Warren Hastings differed so much in all respects from that of the parliamentary commission, that it was calculated to modify unavoidably that of any reasonable and impartial man. Moreover, the personal fortune of the accused was very far from being equal to the ideas given of it by the charges made against him of peculation ; and the fact is, that no complaint ever came from India or from the Company, and every vessel which arrived from Calcutta, bore on the contrary, evidence in his exculpation.

Such a combination of evidence is not to be bought with all the money in the world. A meritorious work on Hindostan, published in 1839, observes: "To this day the Hindoos pronounce the name of their former Governor with enthusiasm and blessings ; they sing verses in his praise. Had the fate of Warren Hastings permitted him to end his days in India, the multitude would have made pious pilgrimages yearly to his tomb, in the superstitious belief that his spirit still hovered above the country which preserved so grateful a recollection of his services."*

This famous affair evidently arose from the suggestions of jealousy and spite,† and was prosecuted by party-spirit and the stimulus of vanity. If the conduct of Pitt, who abandoned Hastings to the Opposition, is quoted as con-

* "Sketches of Hindostan," by Miss Robarts.

† Burke is thought to have never forgiven Hastings for not nominating one of his near relations to an important office which he had solicited in his behalf.

clusive against him, we may cite, not the saying, more familiar than authentic, attributed to Lord Chancellor Thurlow,* but another very energetic speech from no less a man than Lord Mansfield, who filled for thirty-two years the office of Chief Justice of the King's Bench, with the most unimpeachable reputation for sagacity, talents and virtue. Talking one day with Sir John Macpherson about Pitt, he condemned the latter for having abandoned Hastings, an action, as he said, unworthy of a great minister. "But, perhaps," observed Macpherson, "a feeling of justice demanded it of him." "Justice! Sir John!" rejoined the venerable judge: "I have forty years administered justice between man and man. As for political justice, justice between minister and minister, it is a profanation of the term, a blood-stained phantom."†

When in 1795, after eight years' debate, the trial resulted in the acquittal of Hastings, Mallet du Pan, then at Berne, addressed the following letter to him; which alone would prove, were it requisite, that the share of the "Mercure" and its editor in this important matter was perfectly disinterested:

* "Doubtless you hate me," said Pitt to the Chancellor, "for having seconded the Opposition in its impeachment of Mr. Hastings." "I do not prostitute," replied Thurlow, "so noble a passion as hatred, to condemn an act which deserves nothing but contempt."

† This same Lord Mansfield said to Pitt: "Supposing that Mr. Hastings *did* rob the Indians, as you allege, of two millions; you admit that he remitted the money to the Company, and employed it in the service of the State. If you condemn him, you, the Government, are bound to restore the two millions sterling by which you profited."

“ Berne, July 29, 1795.

“ Sir,

“ I once had the honour, when in Paris, of enrolling myself among your defenders, and of serving with my poor abilities the cause in which you have just triumphed. Allow me to offer you my congratulations, and to repeat to you the joy with which I beheld you issue from that unprecedented struggle, with a success which your accusers were able to retard, but not to prevent. All Europe applauds the verdict which has restored you to the position you should never have lost.

“ The justice of men can never be a compensation for the cruelty of the proceedings, for your sufferings, the inroads they have made on your health, for so many trials borne by you with the dignity and fortitude which belong to your character. You are as great on the banks of the Thames, as you were on the banks of the Ganges. May your countrymen appreciate the worth of such a citizen, and atone for the efforts by which enmity and party spirit have paralysed for eight years talents, which have been the glory and the prosperity of England.”*

* The following year, Mallet du Pan's son was received in London by Warren Hastings in a manner which amply testified how grateful a recollection he preserved of his late defender, and how much respect he entertained for his character. “ Mr. Hastings has paid me a visit,” wrote M. Mallet to his father, “ which no one else has done; and, as I could not dine with him, and he had to leave next day for the country, he begged me to pass the following day with him previous to his departure. I accepted, and he expressed to me how much gratitude he felt for what you had done in his cause, and the desire he had to serve me. He told me that he had few, if any, acquaintances calculated to be useful to me, as he had made it a rule during his trial to owe his vindication to nothing

but the justice of his cause. ‘Nevertheless,’ said he, ‘I might perhaps do something indirectly, and whatever I can do I will. Write to me if you have occasion in any respect, for protection, money, &c. I shall return to town in three weeks, and my first concern will be to see you.’ I had been told he was very undemonstrative : I found him kind to me beyond expression. M. Malouet told me that he never promised anything, never gave any hopes ; but that he was more active in obliging than any one else.”

CHAPTER V.

1784—1789.

Articles of Mallet in the literary department of the “*Mercure*”—Montesquieu on Republics—Grotius and the law of nations—Ideas upon political economy—Learning and manners at the close of the eighteenth century—Life of Mallet in Paris—Pancoucke’s household—Buffon—Anecdotes.

INTEGRITY has great privileges. Notwithstanding profound differences upon many important points of domestic and foreign politics, notwithstanding the enemies which Mallet du Pan had made among the courtiers and politicians of different parties, frequently amazed by the boldness of the truths of which he never restrained the expression, Mallet was retained on the “*Mercure*.” He was rigorously supervised, however, and the three censors for that purpose, most lavishly exercised the pruning-knife. Nay, “*cancels*” were not wanting in the “*Mercure*,” and it was not an unfrequent occurrence that, on the point of going to press, the editor, finding the matter of his number reduced to a sheet or two by the censorial talons, found himself under the necessity of supplying these gaps at a moment’s notice. Upon the whole, Mallet’s was an ungrateful task, and would have been insupportable to a spirit

so free and so reflective, if he had not been able to give unbounded range to his thoughts in the literary portion of the journal. The greater part of the works—which succeeded each other with a profusion upon the great subject of political philosophy—were submitted to his analysis: he devoted to them articles always studied conscientiously and written in a vigorous and animated style, which sufficiently distinguished them from the more elegant and ornate contributions of his *collaborateurs*. These articles are the productions of no ordinary thinker; many are very curious to read, even at the present time.

In perusing these articles, one is in the first instance struck by the tone of opposition which characterizes them, and from which the reader might be induced to attribute the constant vivacity of the author to a paradoxical turn of mind. It was because, a republican by birth, and always ready to expose the vices of despotic governments; severe in his strictures on corruption and frivolity wherever he meets with them, Mallet was not a less severe critic of the theories of reformers, in which character he unsparingly censured the folly of those philosophers who pretended to regenerate society by means of their declamations. It will be easy to imagine what scornful impatience would be felt by a man of his experience and enlightenment, to whom political affairs had become familiarized by a long study of history and social institutions, on seeing the recklessness with which the most weighty questions concerning the science of government were decided, and especially the levity with which the would-be pupils of Rousseau began talking about republicanism. Let us hear with what disdain he spoke of

certain detractors of Montesquieu, in reference to his views of republican states :

“ I do not know,” he says, “ whether that great genius was in error or not in his opinions upon monarchy and despotism : with that I have no concern, and little interest ; but, the child of a republic, and having at a very early age been compelled by unfortunate circumstances to study republican forms of government, I have always been amazed by the astonishing sagacity with which Montesquieu has spoken of them. There is no free state which is wanting in a feeling of veneration for the name of this great writer, so impudently attacked for some years past in his own country by that host of vain and frivolous talkers, who judge the government of a nation as they would of an opera.”*

In an examination of a book by M. Valazé upon the penal law, a work of which he speaks with great esteem, he commences with this reproach, addressed to the inconsiderateness of the modern jurists.

“ The greater part of the writers who, during some years, have treated of these matters, appear scarcely to have perceived their difficulty. By substituting metaphysics for experience, and eloquence for discussion, it is very easy to govern the world by means of generalities. But when we observe the legal libraries, the works upon the laws, the commentaries, the controversies, the definitions, the customs, the researches, and the different codes with which the world is encumbered, we ought to be very cautious in determining those fixed rules from whence

* “ *Mercur de France*,” 1786. Article upon the “ *Travels in Italy*,” by Lalande.

result the duties and the rights of the whole human race.”*

Mallet, both in character and from the natural tendency of his mind, belonged (as we have already had occasion to observe) with regard to legislation as well as politics, to the school of observation and moral sense. His principles were those of justice, his views formed from experience. His distrust of schemes and his preference for the appreciation of facts are well displayed in a page upon Grotius and his successors, the constructors of the theories of the law of nations.

“Whether war be or be not founded on a basis of right, it exists none the less. Sovereigns would scarcely think of composing their manifestoes in accordance with the obscure metaphysics of philosophers: custom and treaties—these are the only authorities consulted. From thence has resulted a code, which, although it may be artificial, contrary to natural law, to reason and religion, has nevertheless received from long usage the force of law. Nothing is therefore more futile than argumentation upon these subjects: the law of nations is nothing more than a system of facts and usages. Grotius and his successors have employed an immense amount of erudition upon a full exposition of them; they have applied them to an infinity of possible cases. In this respect and up to this point their labours were useful; but they wished to introduce the law of nature into the midst of this monument, to make justice its architect and its divinity, to transform custom into right, to build doctrines on sand, and to prescribe to us as so many eternal rules, the accidental habits.

* “*Mercur de France*,” 1784, No. 12.

forms, methods, admitted or despised, according to the vicissitudes of civil society. Hence these systems, as unintelligible as cruel; these maxims of Kings represented as the maxims of nature; the customs of the Canaanites and the Teutons as the course of Providence: and this jumble of science and nonsense, which, supporting the principles of the Greeks by those of the Hebrews, the verses of Homer by passages from the Bible, has made Grotius and many others the systematic enemies of the human race.

“ Instead of bewildering ourselves by entering into a refutation of such a medley of distinctions, divisions, precepts and arguments, it is preferable to establish firmly for ourselves the morals of nations. Perhaps a simple history of the law of nations would be more instructive than the arbitrary jurisprudence of this author.”*

In political economy Mallet opposed the too hasty theorists with the same distrust and the same careful examination of facts and arguments. It was with the discussion of economical problems that he had entered upon his public career: Quesnay and his disciples; the chimeras periodically put forth in their journal the “*Ephémérides*,” had exercised his talent for the analysis of such subjects, and, it must be admitted, had also left in his mind a ground-work of exaggerated prepossession against the political economists and even against Turgot, whom he called, not their disciple, but their dupe. However that may be, he displayed in connexion with these subjects a very great knowledge of facts and very decisive views; he also treated of them with great sagacity. With the exception of M. Necker, there were at that time but few persons in

* “*Mercur de France*,” 1786, No. 33.

France possessing a more precise acquaintance with economical science, its aims and its scopes, or a more thorough mastery of its language. Although he placed Parmentier before all other political economists in the world, and designated the grave calculations of the time upon the balance of power as "rules of proportion constructed with imaginary figures," he did not on that account deny the utility of researches upon the wealth of nations. He had studied the works of Adam Smith in the original, for which he professed a high admiration; only he considered that men should not dogmatize in a science, the first principles of which were still matter of discussion, and in all cases susceptible of an application eminently variable.

"The better works upon political economy," says he, "such as those of Adam Smith in England, of MM. de Forbonnais and Necker in France, are less general treatises, than books specially adapted to the countries in which they have been written. Our modern teachers consider this circumspection very puerile and unworthy of genius, an opinion at which we must not be surprised from such nations as are accustomed to rule the entire globe from Spitzbergen to the Cape."

In another place, he says :

"The rural, not the political economist, whose business in France is the culture of potatoes; the peasant of Zurich, who doubles the produce of his meadows, have done more for society than a thousand treatises upon luxury, by which the authors have not prevented the sale of a yard of lace, and which put forth a host of hypotheses upon wealth, which have not made the poor a penny richer."

"It would be absurd to regard as idle all the philo-

sophic researches into matters as important. We possess several works extremely systematic, yet without the prejudices of the systematizing spirit, in which the history of facts confirms the exposition of principles; in which, by comparing customs with their effects, the causes of good and evil are unfolded, so as to arrive at results which are thus prevented from becoming vague. As a work possessing these characteristics, we must name that of Mr. Adam Smith upon the 'Wealth of Nations.' "

It is not possible to avoid the belief that, in consequence of this distrust of theories, Mallet would have been capable of aiding in the diffusion throughout France of the rational and practical study of political economy. He was occupied in doing so, but this part of his works was seized with the rest during the Revolution; and there is no other evidence remaining of his knowledge and his ability in these matters, than some articles from the *Journal*.

The moral critic of the "*Annales*," is also recognized sometimes in the "*Mercur*," and never otherwise than advantageously.* This remark is noticeable in reference to a violent attack on Rousseau in a book by M. Rigoley de Juvigny, on the decay of letters and morals, from the times of the Greeks and Romans to our own.

"It is impossible to justify the violence with which M

* In the article "*Mallet du Pan*," in the biographical dictionaries, are the titles of different works which are nothing more than some of the articles furnished by Mallet either to the literary department of the "*Mercur*," or to the "*Journal encyclopédique*." Such, for example, is the "*Tombeau de l'île de Jonings*," a kind of romantic tale, which commences with an interesting sketch of the Convent of St. Bernard.

de Juvigny has traduced J. J. Rousseau. . . . How is it possible that he could have allowed himself to accuse of hypocrisy and a pretended belief in the Divinity, a writer who has demonstrated the principles of natural law with more energy and sincerity than those of any other age ; who never hinted a doubt on this subject ; who professed the fundamental dogmas with enthusiasm, and who separated himself from certain pretended philosophers solely from his aversion to the pernicious systems which have made such ravages among us ? I have always found it difficult to comprehend the obtuseness of those impetuous and irrational spirits, who, while seeing Rousseau in all cases defend the primary truths of religion, morals, domestic duties and public and private virtues, have not failed to class him with those sophists who root up the foundations of all moral obligation, and to attach themselves to these latter with an obstinacy more furious than that which they manifest towards avowed atheists."

It is further necessary to quote a parallel sketch of the philosophy and manners of France at the close of the eighteenth century, not only because it is spirited, but because it clearly indicates the tendency of Mallet's opinions upon the age.

" If early in the part of this century the bent of men's mind and genius was inclined towards pursuits of another kind, it is wrong to say that there was no longer either learning or genius.

" Impartiality required of M. de Juvigny that he should have made this observation, and that he should have balanced our advantages and disadvantages. This would have added force to his arguments as he approached our own day ; he would have compared more happily the dreadful

nullity with which we are charged, with the splendour of the last century and the talents of the last reign ; he would have shown how the usurpations of the philosophic spirit over literature had deadened imagination ; how, by dint of seeking for the why and the wherefore of the beautiful, we have had whole libraries of metaphysical arguments and no more dramatic art, no more poetry, no more productive literature. Passing afterwards to the actual state of the human mind, he should have endeavoured to learn whether enlightenment did in fact result from the multitude of authors who called themselves enlightened ; whether the systematizing spirit, seeking refuge from science in speculative philosophy, had not rendered problematical more important truths than it had discovered ; whether anything else resulted from this than an exaggeration in doctrines which had ceased to be any longer useful-- than an anarchy of opinions, a universal scepticism—which proves to us at the same time an excessive credulity and prejudice united with the most positive knowledge ; whether the same enlightenment was not worse than ignorance ; whether the actual boldness of ideas had not its cause in the want of reflection more than in the profitable independence of mind ; lastly, whether the mutually antagonistic opinions of some thousands of writers constituted philosophy and truth.

“Instead of deploring with a zeal sometimes declamatory the depravity of our age, and characterizing it by our fashions or other details of little importance, M. de Juvigny should have examined what had been the influence of our enlightenment upon our morals—a great and noble subject upon which he touches without investigating it. He should have remembered that the essential point was

not to preach virtue, but to practise it; and that if it was true, as Helvetius and others have concluded, that without a profound knowledge of philosophy it was not possible for a man to be good, it would follow that Cæsar must have been a better citizen than Cincinnatus, and Nero, so well educated by the wise Seneca, a model of wisdom and humanity in comparison with Henry IV. ‘On this supposition,’ says J. J. Rousseau, ‘there can be no true probity except among philosophers:—they act prudently, beyond question, in complimenting each other on the fact.’ After this, the author should have inquired how it is that we have so much immorality with a deluge of moralists; so many chatterers who think only of themselves, and who grow enthusiastic about the love of our neighbours; so much selfishness in actions and humanity in the journals; so much clamorous love of liberty with so many vices which exclude the sentiment of it; finally, how so many depraved men absolve themselves from being honest because they talk of honour! The description of this moral hypocrisy, a thousand times more detestable than that of religion, to which it has succeeded, merited especial attention. It would have been curious to examine how the inconsistency of some modern doctrines has produced this contradiction between manners and opinions.”

The life which Mallet du Pan led during the five years which intervened between his arrival at Paris and the commencement of the revolution, was, like his opinions and turn of mind, sufficiently foreign to the general current of habits and manners of Parisian society. Not having any relations at Paris, his family lived in great

retirement,* and in the bosom of his family, he was entirely devoted to his task of journalist, which he contemplated from

* An exception must be made with regard to Panckoucke in this respect, whose house was more than hospitable to Mallet and his family, from the time of their arrival in Paris. The relations between author and bookseller are not always of the most easy description: those between the editor and the publisher of the "*Mercury*" were constantly based on confidence, mutual esteem, and intimacy. Their two families were in close friendship. That of Panckoucke offered to the children of the laborious journalist resources at once rare and precious. Some features of the portrait of this remarkable man and his home, as traced by Suard, deserve reproduction in this place.

"M. Panckoucke was a native of Lille, in Flanders, where his father had a large book-trade. He was destined by the course of his studies, and his mathematical talents, for a professorship; but, at his father's death, he resolved on following his business for the support of his mother and family. He aimed at making his trade subservient to new and large objects. He repaired to Paris, where he settled, with two of his sisters, in the chief literary quarter, then also the handsomest, near the *Comédie Française* and the *Procope Café*. With him, and through his exertions, commenced a very remarkable amelioration in the position of literary men, kept so long in poverty by the humiliating wages they received from publishers, and by the very honourable, but insignificant remuneration of men in power. Panckoucke regarded whatever excessive profit he might derive from their exertions, as not pertaining to his personal fortune. His honourable conduct made him the equal and the friend of the men of genius for whom his presses worked. His carriage was often to be met on the road to Rousseau's house at Montmorency, Buffon's at Montbard, or Voltaire's at Ferney; and, as the works of these immortal writers had become matters of state, his carriage took him from their abodes to the King's ministers at Versailles, who received him as a functionary possessing, like themselves, a portfolio of his own. A position of such unique consideration raised no jealousy among his fellows, because it became reflected on themselves: because, in circumstances of difficulty, he always set the

so enlarged a point of view. In his capacity as a man of letters, and the principal writer of a publication becoming every day more important and respected, he naturally occupied a conspicuous position, and his presence was received with attention in the distinguished society of the saloons where politics gradually supplanted literature; but he rarely availed himself of this opportunity. This society, so select and so attractive, ill accorded with his tastes and habits.

He was frequently heard to say that: "Paris commenced by astonishing, it afterwards amused, then it fatigued." His favourite relaxations were walking (which was his frequent practice), the *soirées* in his family, and the Opera Buffa, to which he frequently took his children, as he was a great amateur of Italian music. Brought up with simplicity, and under the influence of strictly moral sentiments, he did not look with a favourable eye upon the excessive luxury and the dissipated life of the upper

example of sacrifice, and his example, as soon as given, was followed by all.

His houses at Paris and Boulogne brought together, like those of Helvétius and Baron d'Holbach, the *élite* of men of letters, artists, and scientific men. He not only printed the works of others, but some of his own also. Amid all the minute cares of a business of several millions, he found time to write, and felt the need of doing so.

"In the saloons of his wife, in the studies of his children, doors leaving pianos visible, easels supporting drawings—all displayed the feeling for the Arts which reigned in his house."

The social and universal overthrow which succeeded these days of prosperity, and changed the aspect of this picture, never caused the slightest change in the friendly relations of the Panckoucke family, and that of Mallet du Pan.

classes in Paris ; and he was perhaps too strongly inclined to treat with contempt the philosophic pretensions of the fashionable world. He had accustomed himself to great liberty of opinion and speech, and he was singularly deficient in that easy and graceful complaisance necessary to ensure a welcome at the table of the Mæcenases of the time. These undoubtedly paid court to men of letters ; but it was under the tacit understanding that they should repay them with deference and compliment. The contract was strictly fulfilled on both sides ; but Mallet du Pan possessed neither dexterity nor inclination for this exchange. It was true that the clever despotism of the school of d'Alembert no longer controlled all opinion and confidence ; Marmontel and Suard were men of rational and moderate views ; but the star of the "Encyclopédie" was still high above the horizon ; and a young Genevese, who ventured to question those oracles, could not expect to meet with any very favourable reception.

Further, Mallet was of an essentially meditative turn of mind. Even in his family he was not very communicative ; in society also, unless the conversation turned upon some one of the great subjects which constantly occupied his thoughts, he rarely took an active part in general conversation ; and when he did do so, the somewhat passionate vivacity of his sentiments supplied him with language energetic and picturesque, but not always suited to the refinements of Parisian society. In other respects, plain and in nowise dogmatic, still less pedantic, as Brissot asserted, although he never saw him, he preferred and sought with more pleasure *tête-à-tête* conversation.

So little mixed up in the brilliant gaiety of Paris, it will

readily be understood why he was scarcely alluded to in the memoirs touching upon the society of the period: however, he was on intimate terms with several of the illustrious men of that day; among others with Buffon, of whom he speaks thus in his notes: "M. de Buffon lives in a strictly philosophic manner; he is just without being generous, and his whole conduct is regulated by reason. He is fond of order, and introduces it into whatever he does." This illustrious writer was fond of talking with Mallet, and willingly told him anecdotes. Many of them are interesting, and we extract from the diary of our author those which appeared to us little or not at all known.

"The publication of the '*Histoire naturelle*' was commenced in the same year as the '*Esprit des Lois*:' both works were condemned by the Sorbonne, which sent a deputation to the two authors to induce them to retract their errors. 'The deputies,' said Buffon, 'spoke very politely with me, and I retracted; Montesquieu, more quick of temper, refused.' The Abbé Tamponnet, and the Abbé Jaquet attacked him, among other things, on the ground that, not believing in the existence of matter, he could not consequently believe in the resurrection. 'I believe it as much as you do,' said he to Tamponnet. 'Yes, indeed, my friend, we shall revive, revive together. If it only depends on me, we are agreed.'

"Buffon told me that when Voltaire last visited Paris, M. de Maurepas and M. de Richelieu took him to the Museum of Natural History. It was proposed that the author of the '*Dictionnaire philosophique*' should see with his own eyes some petrified fossils. Some had been

arranged on a table; but Voltaire always avoided going near it.

“J. J. Rousseau went to see Buffon at Montbard; but he would never, in spite of all entreaties, dine, sup, or sleep at the *château*, saying that he had come to see Buffon, and not to look for his dinner.

“The philosophers did not much approve of Buffon: d’Alembert less than the others. It was he who said (*à-propos* of the motto of the ‘*Histoire naturelle*’: ‘*Naturam amplectimur omnem*’). We may well say in this case: ‘Grasp all—lose all.’ It is well known that the encyclopedist would not admit any praise of the beautiful style of M. de Buffon. ‘Oh! fine style!’ said he, ‘mere phrases! a great merit truly. I should not find it hard to write phrases about lions.’ Buffon on his part gave the encyclopedists as good as they brought. He continually exclaimed against the philosophical style, against the dry analysis of matters of feeling, against that which he called a metaphysical mania. Condillac had written against him; but when he went to him to request his vote for the Academy, Buffon received him cheerfully, promised his vote, and, embracing him, said: “You made a statue speak, and I the man himself. I embrace you because you still have some warmth in you; but, my dear Abbé, your statue has none.” At the death of Condillac, he introduced M. de Tressan into the Academy: Tressan delivered his address, in which, according to custom, he eulogized Condillac. He took it to Buffon, who replied, ‘My dear friend, the icy coldness of the dreamer Condillac lay like a maleficent hoar-frost on the flowers of your eloquence.’ His great principle in style is always to refer to man by a word, an

expression, inanimate object or the themes of philosophy."

In society, Mallet was but indifferently received on account of his politics. Joined to the independence and the firmness of his character, the very soundness of his principles and his knowledge tended as a natural consequence to isolate him in a position never in unison with any parties or views. On the one side, he was shocked at the levity of the people, at the corruption of the higher classes, the arrogant tone of the Court, and the arbitrary measures of the Government; on the other, he could not avoid experiencing a strong surprise and presentiment full of apprehension, at seeing subjects of which, by experience, he knew both the tendency and the danger discussed in fashionable saloons by the frequenters of the *cafés*, and even in places of public resort.* The manner in which they were discussed, and the opinions which generally prevailed even among the upper classes, formed such a contrast with the political *régime* which was in power; the state and the demoralization of society were so little in accordance with the religious and social institutions of the old French monarchy, that, born and educated as he had been in republican sentiments, vividly sensible of the benefits of liberty, he was frequently led to combat that indiscreet spirit of innovation, which would be fatal to France, if they ever happened to come into actual practice, and which were only despicable while they remained as ideas. We shall see hereafter what he thought

* "I heard Marat," he somewhere says, "reading and commenting on the 'Contrat social,' in 1788, in places of public resort, amid the plaudits of an enthusiastic audience."

of the chances of safety left to the monarchy, the means of reconciling its existence and its security, by emancipating itself from its dangerous despotism, and establishing liberty. But it must be observed, that up to the time when the assembly of the States-General came to be talked of, he dreaded a feeble dissolution, a vital deterioration of the State, rather than a violent revolution. What he daily saw of the fickleness of Parliament, of the levity, and even pusillanimity of the people, made him shrug his shoulders:—he had no faith in any effort of the nation to give itself a free constitution.

Unable either to write or talk with freedom upon all he thought and foresaw, Mallet commenced in 1785 to collect for his own satisfaction what he called his “*Historical Observations upon Paris.*” This is a kind of private diary, in which he noted down his reflections upon the events and men of the day, the political facts, the especial circumstances brought under his notice—in short, all the features of that epoch of tumult, excitement, and puerility, which are certainly piquant, even in themselves, but terrible though instructive, when we peruse their annals at the present time.

The general contempt into which the government of the monarchy had fallen, its ignorance of the disregard and outrages which were inflicted upon it by anonymous enemies, a succession of ministers coming into contact on all sides with an aggressive literature, the parliaments with private rights; the Court arrogant with individuals, feeble in action, wavering, irresolute in all measures of importance, prodigal of favours and pensions to men of letters who laboured to demolish the old edifice; hard by,

the people apparently as gay and thoughtless as in the most palmy times of the monarchy; Gluck and Piccini, Cagliostro and Beaumarchais, successively absorbing the public interest — such times, and such circumstances, furnished perpetual subjects of observation to a man of sense and gifted as Mallet was, with great political discernment; with abundance of leisure and a calmer temperament, a less strong and painful interest in affairs, he might have written memoirs of the highest value. His unpretending notes, dispersed through his diary, possess nevertheless sufficient historical importance to relieve us of all hesitation in introducing at least a few fragments to the reader.

CHAPTER VI.

1785—1787.

Private Journal of Mallet du Pan—Historical and moral observations concerning Paris from 1785 to 1789.

AT this period men of letters no longer constituted a class but a disorganized and rapacious rabble, among which, those only who held the highest positions possessed reputation and competence; the remainder were in very reduced circumstances, and continually menaced by destitution. In vain the more active of them emigrated to Holland and to England to take advantage of the literary mania which the example of France, always leading other countries in its wake, had spread far and wide:* in Paris this unfortunate race only continued to increase in numbers and in misery. This starving population of would-be authors may well be reckoned as one among those causes which indirectly contributed to the general demoralization of character during the latter half of the last century; the necessity of living

* An idea may be formed, in reading Brissot's Memoirs, of the singular mode of existence which these literary adventurers led, always ready, like Figaro, who is a perfect type of the class, to nibble their pen and ask upon what subject they were to write.

and the difficulty of living honourably, joined to a mediocrity, or absolute want of ability, drove the enormous number of scribblers to the lowest extremes of debasement. The republic of letters was at that period a deplorable one, a melancholy prelude of that which was about to succeed it.

“Academies, museums, literary societies,” writes Mallet in his Diary, “are pernicious institutions which multiply the number of authors and increase the mania for writing. This madness is now at its height, and they encourage it. Paris is full of young people who mistake some degree of readiness for talent: clerks, lawyers, and soldiers, who are ambitious of becoming authors, starve, beg even—and write pamphlets. One of them enlisted a few days since, and if he cannot pay his service-money in a month, he must remain a common soldier.

The majority of the ministers, unable to perceive that this condition of affairs was dangerous to the State, or believing that it could be allayed by servility, urged the literary profession to this state of degradation by paying the pamphleteers in their employ, and by holding out the allurements of extraordinary rewards to the time-serving spirit of writers of note. By these pretended encouragements, which were not always justified by their object, it was supposed possible to trammel the new sovereign of opinion, the restless demon of philosophism. It is true that the avidity with which too many literary men accepted these bribes was well calculated to keep up the illusions of the government.

There was a large distribution of new pensions, when M. de Calonne undertook to restore, by dint of profusion, the

exhausted fortunes of France. Here is the opinion which was entertained of this attempt in Mallet's circle.

"A certain number of literary men have accepted the badge of servitude, in other words, the new pensions due to the liberality of M. de Calonne : those upon whom these favours have been bestowed are for the most part flatterers, spies, intrigues, and protégés. How scandalous and extravagant ! The men of letters in Paris are, generally speaking, delighted with these marks of attention. Three hundred of them have applied for pensions, and among others even Mercier."

In return for this artfully contrived liberality, men in office received the adulation which was showered upon them by the future eulogists of the revolution.

"The poet Le Brun (Pindar Le Brun, author of the ode to the ship "*Le Vengeur*"), has just published a dialogue in verse between an opponent of the Court and a citizen, in which the former is of course plentifully abused. It is an emphatic panegyric of the Assembly of Notables, of the King, of M. de Calonne, and of M. de Vergennes. It contains among others these sweet lines :

" Le hibou peut-il voir de son regard timide
C'e que l'aigle et Calonne ont vu d'un œil rapide "

"It concludes thus :

" Digne sang de Henri, puis-je te méconnaître ?
Que dis-je ! Il vit encore, et Sully va renaître.

"Three months ago this modest Le Brun received a pension of two thousand livres from the Comptroller-General. He has not proved ungrateful."

The censors allowed still more shameful flatteries to pass unheeded, even in the Government gazettes, and Louis XVI, was himself obliged to reprimand them, which shows how ill supported were the intentions and honesty of the poor King.

“Bastide, in the prospectus of his “*Journal des Variétés historiques*,” for the benefit of the captives in Algeria, has lauded the munificence of his subscriber, the Comptroller-General, M. de Calonne, and called him *the virtuous minister*. The “*Gazette de France*” copied this advertisement; and the word *virtuous*, after having been allowed to pass by the fifteen censors, was erased by the King. M. de Calonne, who had seen it in the proof, took great pains to learn the reason for its being struck out.”

The astonishment of the censors at a scruple of this kind, which was of very unfrequent occurrence in their experience, may readily be imagined. In fact, the literary police, at all times liable to blunders, were uninfluenced by any fixed principles of action. Since the contending ministerial parties had begun to avail themselves of pamphlets as weapons of defence and attack, the censors were in continual dread of committing some blunder. Thus, for example, it happened that the Parliament were compelled to acquit one M. Lemaitre, because he declared that the printing presses found at his house were the remains of those with which the Chancellor made him print his correspondence, and M. de Maurepas his libel upon M. Necker. They were upon safe ground only in the case of matters of philosophical offences. In 1785, even amid the depravity of manners, and the general licentiousness of opinion, they gravely inflicted upon Suard a fine of six hundred livres, as a punishment

for having inserted in the "Journal de Paris" an account of the death of Barthe, in which he was represented to have died *philosophically*—that is, without either extremeunction or confession.

It would be committing an injustice not to acknowledge that there was in France, during the latter years of the century, since the accession of Louis XVI, a sincere and ardent desire to ameliorate the condition of the people, and to reform the innuenerable abuses which in the course of time had perverted all the institutions of the country, and that many were honestly engaged in this laudable endeavour. Without speaking of the King, who was anxious to bring about these kind of reforms, but was not very capable of insisting upon any one of them; nor of Turgot, whose too systematic views had led him astray from the promising course which was open to him; nor of Necker, who achieved more in this direction than any or all the others, although his labour has received no recognition among the thousands of statues which the people of Paris have raised to the memory of their benefactors around the Hôtel de Ville;—there were some who visited the hospitals and prisons, and made known their dreadful condition and insufficiency, others who sought to increase the supply of food for the people, otherwise than by giving free scope to the exportation of grain. But that element of success which was most wanting in all these attempts, was a strong unanimity of opinion. There was, in reality, no curiosity or interest evinced in Paris for anything except the occurrences, great and small, of the Court and town, the perpetual change of the ministry, the multitudinizing of parliament and the new political *pamphlets*—for these were the only things which

at all responded to the universal feeling. Notwithstanding the "Encyclopédie," and wisdom dealt out to the human race in the immense number of works of all kinds, the public mind was still ignorant and narrow, and there was abundant evidence that men's opinions, having reached a great degree of power, yet unable to guide itself from the want of any leading principles, would sacrifice its independence and its influence to the gratification of the blind passions of the multitude, and to the objects of its leaders. The Court on its part contributed with an almost incredible recklessness to the disorganization of those ideas and customs which ought to constitute the foundation of all governments, and of which royalty was then more than ever in need.

The diary of Mallet du Pan contains numerous remarks upon the administration of the kingdom, upon the tendency of its politics, and the public spirit of that time, remarks which are worthy of being consulted by historians who would appreciate their truthfulness and the severity of thought natural to the observer.

"The people of Paris and the political writers take no notice of the provinces; to judge from their writings and conversation, the government would not appear to extend beyond the barriers of Paris.

"The Abbé Maury has well observed, in his panegyric of St. Vincent de Paul, that public spirit is so rare in France, that it is religion alone which has established any useful institutions there. St. Vincent founded thirty-five houses of charity. Not a single writer of the time of Louis XIV, has even mentioned him: nor had Voltaire.

“ This is the age of great financial speculations by Joint-stock Companies. These, however unjust may be their projects, are supported by the nobility and the ladies of the court, to whom they furnish interest while dependent on their credit. We should soon see the aristocracy clerks at the barrière, if that would be likely to bring them in twenty thousand livres.

“ The court has prohibited the publication of the petition of M. Séguier against the pamphlet of M. Dupaty, with reference to the case of the three men condemned to the rack. After having allowed this pamphlet, so defamatory to the tribunal, to be sold in all the public places, they have prohibited the refutation put forth by the tribunal itself. Such things as this could not occur anywhere but in France, where governmental power is mixed up with, and interferes with everything, and that by means of intrigues and private motives of which the public are never but imperfectly informed.

“ Thus it is that the pleading of Linguet against the Duc d'Aiguillon has been tolerated. He spoke on the 26th of August for an hour and a quarter, and the hearing was adjourned until the 2nd of this month. On that day he resumed his address. Such a scene as then presented itself was never before witnessed in the court. Although the hearing was at seven o'clock, the crowd was far greater than at the trial of the Cardinal. The large hall, the bar, the passages, the ante-room, the grand saloon, corridors, the large staircase, and the court were all filled. Several persons were seriously injured, some were suffocated, and many fainted; a young student of the College of Louis le Grand was killed. It was a terrible

sight to see persons coming out of the large room during the course of the pleading, half-dead, drenched with perspiration, without shoes or hats, as if in the disorder of a battle. There is never any assemblage of people in Paris without some accident. There were, nevertheless, forty guards. They allowed every one to enter; waiters from the cafés, butchers, pickpockets, clerks, under-clerks, and even fish-women. Such was the audience, whose enthusiasm was excited by the epigrams of M. Linguet. Upon leaving the court, he was cheered on as far as his carriage. The speech he delivered was not a pleading but an historical and satirical romance of his life during the last ten years. He defamed the Duke, M. de Maupeou, the advocates, M. de Lolme, the Duke's counsel, who had not uttered a single word. This flood of satire and invective was permitted by the Court throughout his address, and applauded by the delighted audience. Nothing could be more scandalous than this tumultuous sitting."

December 1787.—"Opinions and political systems at Versailles change from day to day. There is neither precedent nor principle: the same views never last for three days together. It is the vacillation of utter weakness and incapacity."

December 1787.—"The French government has successively destroyed and established every form of government in other countries. Democracy, which it says is always fatal, it destroyed at Geneva to substitute aristocracy; it destroys the aristocracy of Sweden to establish a monarch, and the aristocracy in America to establish democracy."

December 1787. - "The edict in favour of the Pro-

testants goes on slowly, and meets with much opposition. It is singular to observe general opinion divided upon this measure; to hear all the old fears and nonsense revived, and the subject discussed as if the world were just created. It is a proof that enlightenment has made but very slight and limited progress. The Abbé Beauregard has written a lampoon upon the subject, worthy of de Caveyrac, at the desire of the wife of Marshal de Noailles, and she sells and distributes it. The monks in their convents have exhibited the holy sacrament to supplicate God to turn the King from the fatal intention of tolerating the Protestants. M. de Malesherbes has written a large work in their favour, as if there were not enough books upon the subject."

January 1788.—"The majority of the Parisians are opposed to the Edict of Toleration. On all sides one hears on this subject opinions dating from the time of the League. There is even such extreme timidity in men's minds and in the Government, that it is considered a very great indulgence to have granted the Calvinists the legality of their baptisms and marriages."

The collection from whence these extracts are taken, contains a considerable number of particulars relating to Louis XV, Louis XVI, his court and ministers: the greater part of these are already known. The following have a particular interest.

"Last month I saw the King while hunting in the forest of Verrières. The rain compelled him and his attendants to dismount: he took shelter under the trees where I stood with some friends. He did not speak to any one during the half hour he was there."

Upon one occasion Mallet visited Versailles, and his curiosity was especially excited by the King's library.

“The private library of the King consists of choice works of different kinds, all magnificently bound and contained in glazed book-cases. In an adjoining library, which is in the small upper room, are the new works. I saw there a great number of English books of travels, history, science, the ‘English Review,’ the ‘Annual Register,’ &c., &c. The ill-written reply of President Coppay to M. Necker's book stood by the side of the latter work. There were collections of the Gazettes of Leyden, Amsterdam, the Lower Rhine, the ‘Journal de Paris,’ Affiches, ‘Gazette de France,’ and the Statutes at large of the English Parliament during several years. The King read a great deal, and with the exception of the ‘Encyclopédie,’ all the books in his library have passed through his hands. He prefers English works to French. He had read in a translation the whole of the English ‘Universal History.’”

The affair of Cardinal Rohan, and the opinions which were generally entertained upon it, form the subject of numerous remarks in this collection; but this scandalous affair has been already so frequently treated of, that any further allusion here would be superfluous: after the foregoing observations, it may readily be imagined what opinions Mallet would form, both of the circumstances and of the trial.

As the reign of Louis XVI. advanced from minister to minister, from one *coup d'état* to another, towards the great crisis, the notes of the collection which we shall go through, become more interesting as well as more

extended: some of them are historical relations. It is necessary to reproduce all this part of the diary, together with the opinions of the observer, because they will show better than we can point out, what were his sentiments when the revolution broke out.

January, 1787.—"The Assembly of Notables fixed for the 29th. All kinds of conjectures and gossip. It is supposed that the idea comes from M. de Calonne upon his last legs, who has lighted on this means of sustaining himself, and of saving his plans from registration by the Parliament. No end of epigrams on one side, rather silly enthusiasm on the other.

"The *Prévôt des Marchands* and *Goblet*, the High Sheriff of Paris, are among the deputies: it is said that the town sends its goblet and its pitcher to the Assembly. The list of the nobility presents the names of more men possessing good intentions than firmness and enlightenment.

"A poor devil was arrested, and subsequently released, who sold plaster figures with shaking heads, whom some person unknown advised to put a paper over his stall with the words: *Assembly of Notables*. He made himself hoarse by crying: 'Assembly of Notables!' Such is the character of the people; thus they exercise their levity upon subjects the most serious, and to them the most important. There is a continual flood of jokes, tales, contradictions, fears and hopes—but generally speaking, little reflection.

"The Notables are neither the nation, nor the representatives of the nation, as some foolish people suppose; it is a supplementary council—they have only a consultative vote. The King can dispose of them as he thinks fit, an

they have no power of resistance. It may be foreseen, that a rupture will take place when they present their transactions for registration by the Parliament, who will prove restiff—and then let the minister look to himself.”

February, 1787.—“The speech of M. de Calonne met with an unfavourable reception from the public. They say that it is the Abbé Terray drunk.”

March, 1787.—“The opposition continues in the Assembly of Notables to be very great; the Archbishop of Narbonne is its leader. The Notables who are reproached with servile submission to the absolute will of the King and the minister, are the Count d’Estaing, the Marquis de La Fayette, Le Noir, Bonvalet, &c.

“It seems as if nobody has given any attention to the fact, that by augmenting the already enormous revenues of the King his political power is increased; no one has reflected upon the influence, over the liberty of the people which this increase of power would exert. The efforts should have been concentrated upon economizing, not on augmenting, the revenue; the voting of subsidies at need in case of war should have been reserved to the nation. It was a great opportunity, which will be missed.”

April, 1787.—“To-day, the 4th, it is evident that during the week the comptroller-general must be dismissed, or the Assembly dissolved. That minister deceives the public by every means. He has caused statements to be inserted in the gazettes of Holland by the bulletin-mongers in pay of the police, that all the bureaux accepted—that they were quite satisfied; that the feeble opposition which they had evinced, arose from the personal interests of the

clergy and nobility. Subsequently, he printed his speech alone, then his second speech, which the complaint of the Notables to the King compelled him to retract in the 'Journal de Paris;' and lastly his collection of documents, preceded by a preface offensive to the Notables. Thus, by preventing them from speaking, and by speaking himself, he has succeeded in imposing upon the weak-minded. He is supported by the majority of literary men. They ascribe to him courage, enlarged views, the love of the people, and sparkling eloquence.

"M. de Nicolaï has spoken with energy in the bureau of the Count d'Artois. The Prince attempted to assert his dignity by preventing this expression of opinion, when M. de Castillon said to him: 'Sir, there is no difference here, except between the fauteuil of the Count d'Artois and the chairs upon which we are seated.' The Bishop of Langres and the Duke de Luxembourg have also shown equal resolution.

"*Monsieur* is reported to have forsaken the comptroller-general. The Queen secludes herself, and nothing transpires as to her opinions."

April 9th.—"Yesterday, Easter-day, at eleven o'clock at night, M. de Montmorin waited on M. de Calonne to receive his portfolio, and to intimate to him his dismissal. He has orders to remain at Versailles, until such time as the Court shall determine otherwise: the following day (to-day), M. de Calonne was to have given a brilliant fête at Berny, to opera-girls—to his mistresses. He had gone thither on Friday, and had passed half the day in fitting up a boudoir. Yet, as the King had for two days refused to see him, he might have expected some catastrophe.

“His fall is owing to circumstances: it was a death-struggle between the Assembly and him. The King had received hundreds of communications against him, signed, and all containing the gravest and most authentic charges: finally, he had prepared thirty-two *lettres-de-cachet*, to be distributed to the Notables this week. The King reflected, and made up his mind.”

April 15.—“M. Necker, who has just replied to the calumnies of M. de Calonne, and whose pamphlet, was distributed at his own house on Monday, is banished to a distance of twenty leagues from Paris. Advantage was taken of the absence of the Maréchal de Castries, who is ill at Paris, to carry out the stratagem. The discontent and murmurs are loud and general. Even the fishwomen buy this pamphlet, which M. Necker was compelled to have printed out of the kingdom. There was a crowd round his door until the time of his departure.”

April 17.—“The King had commanded M. de Calonne to write to M. Joly de Fleury for the examination made of the *Compte rendu*, after the retirement of M. Necker. M. de Fleury replied that that examination, made by an enemy of M. Necker’s, had entirely confirmed the accuracy of the *Compte rendu*. The King asked to see this reply; M. de Calonne who was desirous of gaining time, denied having received it. The King mentioned this to the chancellor, who, already at variance with M. de Calonne, said ‘Sire, it is eight days since M. de Calonne received that reply.’ They quarrelled and recriminated in his presence, and the King decided upon getting rid of them.

“M. de Vergennes, by his cowardice in conniving with M. de Calonne, and by sacrificing any thing that

stood in the way of his interest, has been one of the principal causes of the actual crisis. He and M. de Maurepas have been the unworthy councillors of the King; they have lulled him into indifference to the state of affairs, and have multiplied the intrigues of the Court by their sluggishness and negligence. They must be regarded as the authors of our present misfortunes.

“The Maréchal de Broglie said, in speaking of the fortune of M. de Vergennes: ‘I do not know how our ministers manage at the present day:—they all become opulent. I have seen the Cardinal de Fleury, frugal and simple, leave but little fortune: Orry did not leave more than six thousand livres.’”

June—“The Queen went to the Opera about eight days since, when some insolent fellows called out ‘*Voilà le déficit!*’ which was repeated throughout the house. During the entire sitting of the Assembly of Notables, and notwithstanding the violence of satire, in all public places and societies, not a single person was sent to the Bastille. This is a fact which is attested by M. du Puget, the King’s lieutenant at the Bastille.

“*Tarare* and the Kornman affair will divert and have already diverted the mind from public matters. Nothing more is heard of the Notables, the deficit, &c.”

July 1787.—“The difficulty experienced at the present time is, that there is neither legislation, nor a legislator in France. When the laws are violated, they are appealed to; but when there are none and no heads to make them, everything tends to confusion.”

August.—“A *lit de justice* was held at Versailles upon the 6th, to compel the registration of the stamp duty,

and the territorial subsidy. In one day a tribute had been exacted of more than one hundred and fifty millions—that is, more than the revenue of many great monarchs. At this *lit de justice*, the chancellor, M. de Lamoignon, put forward the principle that the King is the sole administrator, the sole legislator of the kingdom. M. Robert de Saint Vincent is the leader of the opposition in Parliament. The young men of the *enquêtes* make up the remainder—Ferrand, Sémonville, and Eprémesnil.

“Minds are much excited, but not hearts. The members of the opposition are anxious to exhibit their talents for speech-making: there are not more than one or two who would make the slightest sacrifice for the public cause. All this discontent evaporates in bluster. As for the Parisians, they have received the stroke of authority with indifference: there is no movement, and provided they are not deprived of the Opera and the Variétés they are content.”

August 11.—“The declaration upon the stamp-tax and the territorial subsidy has been published. Street-criers were but few, and whether through fear of the public or of the Parliament, they sold it, crying ‘News! News!’ It was certainly a strange spectacle—the King’s edict published thus secretly at a distance of four leagues from Versailles. The excitement of the public mind is very great. On the 13th, the Parliament, after eight hours of deliberation, confirmed the decree of the 7th, by which it declares the transcription void and illegal, all that has passed illegal and unconstitutional, and orders that copies of it should be sent to the magistratures and bailiwicks. There was a crowd at the Court, and when the magistrates came out they commenced a chorus of applause, as if it had been a

place of amusement. Such an event has the appearance of a meeting of school-boys. There were seventy-eight votes for the decree, against thirty-six.

“During the sitting of the first debate upon the stamp-duty, M. d’Artois took upon himself to allude to the English who have this tax, and from whom we copy fashions, carriages, &c. &c. ‘Monseigneur,’ replied M. Robert de Saint-Vincent, ‘we do not pride ourselves upon imitating, and ought not to imitate the English, and you should remember that they have dethroned seven of their kings, and beheaded the eighth.’ The Count having wished the Parliament at the devil, M. de St. Vincent said: ‘If Monsieur was not the King’s brother, the Court ought to commit him at once to the Concierge, for want of respect to this assembly.’ M. d’Artois called him ‘Robert le Diable.’ He is upon the whole a man of very mediocré ability; but honourable, a rigorous Jansenist, and above all corruption.”

August 15th, Day of the Assumption.—“The Parliament has been banished to Troyes; the *lettres de cachet* for each of the members were conveyed by the officers of the French guards, at three o’clock in the morning: they were ordered to leave Paris during the day, and to report themselves in Troyes within four days. The Parliament had committed the error of allowing an interval to elapse between their former resolution and the second, an interval of which advantage had been taken to send the imposts to the *bailliages du ressort* and get them registered. The leaders of the pack are Robert de Saint-Vincent, d’Epréménil, Sabathier, the Abbé Le Coigneux, who was called ‘General Jacko,’ on account of his extremely diminutive form, Semonville, du Pont, &c. &c. This occurrence did

not produce any sensation except in the way of talk during the day. The processions to the Cathedral of Notre Dame have taken place without any disturbance. The absence of the Parliament was scarcely noticed."

August 17th.—"Monsieur went with a large suite to register the taxes at the *Chambre des Comptes*, and the *Comte d'Artois* to do the same at the *Cour des Aides*. It was nine o'clock. Monsieur entered the *Chambre des Comptes*, by the small street of *Sainte Anne*, and was greeted with some applause. The *Comte d'Artois* arrived a quarter of an hour afterwards by the great *Cour du Mai*. Eight or ten thousand people were assembled, filling the large hall, the corridor, the court, the square, and the approaches. Four companies of Swiss and French guards were drawn up in the court-yard, besides the retinue of the Princes, and with their colours flying. The Prince ascended the great staircase through the crowd, and proceeded to the *Sainte-Chapelle* to receive the deputation of the *Cour des Aides*, who went to meet him, and attended him to the bench in front of the large staircase. When he reached this place, the crowd pressed round him, and there was considerable hissing, hooting, and even groaning. The Prince's guards flourished their drawn swords in order to open a passage and disperse the people, and the Prince d'Hénin, Captain of his highnesses's guards, called out to the French and Swiss guards. 'En bas, haut les armes!' At this motion of drawn swords, and at this signal the crowd poured along the staircase and the corridors with inconceivable dismay. I was myself carried over the balustrade. Twenty persons had their arms or legs broken, or were otherwise injured. It was reported that the

Court had been taken by assault. After the moment of panic was over, the crowd recovered a little, the numbers were increased every instant by the passers-by and the curious; but the principal seat of the tumult was in the large hall and the corridor which led from the staircase to the Cour des Aides. This position was occupied by lawyers' clerks, blustering noisy fellows, who, during the sitting from ten o'clock to two, pursued, beat, and maltreated the spies whom they found, or those whom they suspected to be such. When the Prince came, the clapping recommenced with the same violence; but upon the staircase, and in the great hall, they maintained a sullen silence. Nevertheless, I noticed two or three attempts at hissing. Some hooting was heard in the street as far as the quay. The Maréchal d'Aubeterre and two state councillors were in the carriage with the Prince.

"I remarked in general that the crowd evinced more curiosity than irritation. Their cowardice was sufficiently proved by taking to their heels on the mere drawing of a sword from the scabbard. The disorder was exclusively the work of young clerks, and some other ragamuffins somewhat less timid. As to the others, not a single word of sense—no method whatever: it was an *émeute* of beggars more than a revolt. All the shops of the Palais had been closed from the fear of their being robbed. In short, I cannot imagine any scene so fierce in appearance and so flat in reality. The clerks and the inhabitants of the neighbourhood of the Court continued their pursuit of the spies, and their tumult in the afternoon and the next day. There was the same uproar on the following day: the Cour des Aides was sitting for the purpose of recording their reso-

lution against the transcription, as the parliament had done : the mad and stupid applause when they left the Court was unbecoming, and a disgraceful farce. They have burnt a tract, under the title of ‘ Observations of an advocate upon the decision of the parliament,’ which was attributed to Moreau, the historiographer, and have affixed to the pillars of the great staircase, in manuscript : ‘ Decree of the Basoche, condemning a defamatory libel to be burned, as a preliminary to the hanging of its author.’

“ This state of things continued up to yesterday, the 21st, when the Lieutenant-General of the Bailiwick of the Court was sent for from Versailles, reprimanded and compelled to issue a prohibition of processions. The Swiss and French guards have taken possession of the Court, driven out the mob, and sent patroles everywhere through the environs ; they will do the same to-day. The sentries are doubled ; the Court is cleared and everything appears to have become orderly. Many rioters have been arrested.

“ Notwithstanding the military force which was at the Court on the 12th, if the mob had been desirous of committing any excess, or had the Court been forced, the soldiers would not have been able to protect the Prince and his retinue, but this sudden outburst had no meaning : the Court did well to let it go on for a few days.

“ These two lines have been found stuck on the walls of Versailles :

“ ‘ Louis XVI interdit, Antoinette au couvent,
D’Artois à Saint-Lazare, et Provence régent.’ ”

“ The shamelessness of language has been carried so far as to apply the nickname, *le Timbré*, to Louis XVI. The

French people are quite incapable of calm deliberation, and consequently of free government, in which all discussion must be well weighed and moderate.

“Since the clubs have been closed, their *habitués*, formerly noisy declaimers, find out that the Parliament has gone too far, and, if their clubs are re-opened, they will be quite satisfied with the new taxes.”

September.—“Eight days after the Court declared the conduct of the Parliament to be scandalous, illegal, &c., they retracted; and the Parliament, which only worked for States-General, and would sacrifice even their lives for the nation, has registered the prorogation of the two enforced twentieths. The King has followed up this and brands this Parliament by decree. Eight days afterwards, he says to the first president, that he is very well satisfied with the zeal of the Court. There were fifty-eight members in favour of the registration at Troyes, and fifty against. The King has revoked by this new, ‘perpetual, and irrevocable edict,’ those, also ‘perpetual and irrevocable,’ passed a month ago relative to the stamp-duty and the subsidy, and registered with all the pomp of sovereignty. The Count d’Artois said to the Archbishop: ‘The wretch was then sending me to be butchered for his pleasure.’ It is said of the Parliament that they had commenced the onset like Romans, and slunk back like pettyfoggers.”

“On the 30th and preceding days, these shameful lines were found stuck up in many parts of the town :

“Le parlement est fou, je pense,
Car il y perd son latin,
Et veut braver la dépense
D’un régime de sang.

May, 1788.—“Upon the 8th, the day of the *lit de justice*, at Versailles, the Court was again taken possession of by the guards; and so it is to-day. M. d'Agoult, on arriving at the Place Dauphine before the guards, was insulted by the clerks: this disturbance was quickly suppressed. The Pont-Neuf was crowded with lawyers, who were waiting in expectation of the return of the Parliament: not the least commotion perceptible.

“This constable's function of ‘Archer,’ exercised by Baron d'Agoult, did not meet with approbation in good society, where the officers of the French guards are looked upon with jealousy. It is reported that two of them have sent in their resignation. A third presented himself at the house of a lady of high birth; she congratulated herself upon seeing him, since this visit assured her that he also had sent in his resignation; he denied it, (and with truth). The lady pointed to the door, and said to him: ‘Sir, none but honourable men are received here.’ During the night, between the 5th and 6th, a young officer, leaning against the bench of the Court in the grand hall, was playing the wag, and grinning at the King's retinue. M. Herault de Séchelles rises, and addresses him in the most insulting terms.

“The following placard has been attached to the walls of the Court in the midst of the guards:

“ Palais à louer,
Parlement à vendre,
Ministres à pendre,
Couronne à donner.”

“The stock-brokers, capitalists, financiers, men of letters, philosophers and political economists applauded the revolu-

tion. Every one else appears discontented. The partisans of these measures say that the Parliament have acted unwisely, that their administration was full of abuses; that it is imperative that there should be uniformity in a monarchy; that the Parliament have opposed the territorial subsidy from personal motives, that they might not be liable to it; that they are sulky, the King ought to be master, &c. The opposite party reply, that it is necessary in the present instance to consider, not the actual abuses of the administration of justice, which would admit of correction, but the overthrow of the only frail barrier which was left against the will of the ministry; that the Parliaments received formally from the estates of Blois, in 1628, the right of registering and authenticating, in the absence of the estates; that, through party spirit, as contradictors and overlookers of the officers of the sovereign, they denounced daily abuses of authority, *lettres de cachet*, extortion of taxes by decree of the council, favouritism towards the council; &c., that in short this Plenary Court, being only an Aulic Council, there would no longer be any intermediate body in the monarchy, that the aristocracy, being without courage to resist, and the nation a nonentity, the ministers, should the Parliaments be annihilated, would reduce the monarchy to the most absolute despotism.

“The mode in which this policy is effected, is as much censured as the system itself. To hold a *lit de justice* for the purpose of forcing the registration of a law which had not, according to custom, been previously submitted to the Parliament, and upon which there had been no discussion! (the *lits de justice* are the last resort of supreme authority: this one preceded resistance, and even

communication) : bayonets suppressing in a single day institutions centuries old throughout the realm ! Sappers compelling the registration of decrees ! The whole magistracy of France forced in one day to subscribe its own suppression, and leave ministers absolute lords over their will !

“ There is no unity of opinion upon the means of ensuring the success of the operation, nothing but a delusive hope of dividing, bribing, and gaining over the High Court, le Châtelet, &c. In all these proceedings we see men adopting philosophic ideas upon the authority of books, but who are destitute of the ideas of statesmen. In looking at this measure from another point of view, it will be found contrary to public morality. The vice of it consists in the fact that its successful execution has been made to depend upon the perjury of all the magistrates of the kingdom. Their principles are placed in antagonism with the course which they have to pursue—by a violation of their oaths and their duties. Either men flatter themselves they will be able to bend them like rushes—and then what magistrates ! what a revelation to the public in such a sway exercised over them ! Or else it is proposed to crush them if they resist, and then what despotism !

“ Louis XVI., at the height of his power, at absolutely internal peace, possessing vigorous and respected ministers, would scarcely have conceived the idea of a similar revolution. Richelieu would not have presumed to attempt it ; and it is effected in the midst of admitted distress, at a time of inquietude and trouble, and general complaint, after a squandering of the finances—after the admitted errors

and inconsistencies which have emboldened even the Parliament itself.

“However, the influence of this measure is scarcely perceived in Paris, except among the people of the Court. They talk highly of it, and hardly trouble themselves at all about the state of the provinces ; very few men reflect upon the means employed and the natural consequences. In all that is said upon this subject there is not a single idea which is just, comprehensive, and politic.”

August, 1788.—“I learn that propositions have been made to M. Necker by the Maréchal de Castries, and that M. Necker has declined accepting them. Upon this refusal, or from some other circumstances, there was talk of sending M. Necker to the Bastille. Baron de Breteuil has refused to sign and execute the *lettre de cachet*, and this is one of the principal reasons of his resignation, which he has demanded and obtained. He had also been reproached with awkwardness by the Court, for having let the second deputies from Bretagne enter Paris, whom he ought to have kept at Saint-Denis. This imputation of “awkwardness,” shocked him. He retires with a kind of applause from the public, although the stain of his conduct in the affairs of the Cardinal cannot be effaced. He is harsh and haughty ; his abilities mediocere. He has shown some zeal for the embellishment of Paris, and he did service to the Academies, which has procured him the gratitude and flattery of men of letters.

“Had M. Necker been recalled, he would have remained in subjection to the prime minister, and would have been in the position of a Genevese banker, commissioned to

get money for the Court on his credit. As soon as funds had been obtained, he would have been sent about his business.

“ The deficit this year being at least two hundred millions, in consequence of the expenditure of the parliamentary revolution, loans and taxes having become impracticable, it was expected for some weeks that the minister would endeavour to relieve his embarrassment by laying his hands on the government securities. And in fact, upon the 19th, the decision of the council of the 16th was issued, ordering a partial payment in bills of the royal treasury. The alarm has been universal. The public funds have fallen enormously ; numbers of persons have curtailed their equipages, and dismissed some of their servants. Even the theatres experience the effects of this crisis. At the Comédie Italienne seventy-five livres were taken on the 20th, and at the French theatre, eighty-eight livres on the 22nd.

“ The Archbishop of Sens is overwhelmed with maledictions. His fall before sixteen days elapse is predicted.

“ The capitalists, men of business, bankers, fundholders, were in ecstacy when the magistrates were removed by force of arms, when parliaments were suppressed by the soldiery, and the forms of legality were overthrown. They hoped that the King would make quick work with the nation, and compel it to raise taxes. These people are punished for their nonsense, and they find to-day that the same arbitrary authority which could violate the liberty of the people, the constitution, and the law, could equally attack the public trust and property.”

August 24th, 1788.—"To-day the impending disgrace of the prime minister has been announced. There are three cabals against him; one on the part of Castries and Necker; the second by the partizans of Breteuil, of which Rulhière is the contriver; the third, which is the principal and most decisive, by the Count d'Artois, the Count de Vaudreuil, the Polignacs, &c. It is reported that the Abbé Vermont, the Queen's reader, is in much discredit at Court. This Abbé owes his success to M. de Sens, who recommended him to Madame de Grammont and to M. de Choiseul, as reader to her Majesty. He is cool, and circumspect, is possessed of little comprehensiveness of mind, but great tact and dexterity in trifling matters, together with a knowledge of the Court. His judgments of men are correct or incorrect, but when his opinion is once formed, he gets them cashiered. Without being at all averse to M. Necker, he considers him unfit to have the management of the French finances."

August 25th.—"The Archbishop of Sens was dismissed on the 25th, the feast of St. Louis. It is the Count de Vaudreuil and the Polignacs who have persuaded the Count d'Artois to this, and he has persuaded the Queen. The King's aunts supported the project by persuading the King. The same persons have effected the recal of M. Necker—that was their only resource. Distress was at its height. Four hundred thousand livres was the whole amount in the treasury—all the other chests empty: money transactions have been effected at the rate of twenty to twenty-five per cent; authority is in universal discredit, the Government moneyless, in conflict with the whole kingdom. The reduction in fund payments has powerfully

affected the Princes and the nobles concerned. This personal motive has decided what should have been the work of reason alone."

August 26th.—"M. Necker has been summoned to Versailles, received, fêted, and complimented by the Queen, the King, and M. d'Artois. This almost burlesque revolution serves as a thermometer of the distress. In a kingdom of twenty-four million inhabitants, it has been necessary to have recourse to a foreigner, who is a Protestant, a republican, who was dismissed seven years since, who was banished last year, who is personally odious to the Sovereign, and whose principles and character are entirely opposed to those of the Court. M. Necker once nominated, Paris, especially the Palais Royal, the fund-holders, &c., gave vent to their delight. On the morrow, the effigy of M. Sens was burned in the Place Dauphine, and similar illuminations took place in the Palais Royal and various other spots."

September 2nd, 1788.—"Since M. Necker's return, nothing has been done, and murmurs have been renewed. The satirists, in their jeremiads, the quidnuncs, and simpletons of every kind are astounded that M. Necker should not have restored the national finances within three days after coming into office. This succession of changes gives strange notions of the council. It resembles a government of children. The immediate and plenary recal of the Parliament is expected. The funds, which rose on the return of M. Necker, have again fallen."

September 22nd.—"Public confidence is, generally speaking, still partial, and all leave matters to the States General. That is the cant word; it is in everybody's

mouth, without any attempt being made to ascertain what that could and would effect; but the levity, the *ennui*, and the enthusiasm of the people delight to trust to this chance."

September 25th.—"Yesterday and the day before, notices were distributed throughout the town, warning all honest citizens not to leave their houses, seeing that the people intended to take vengeance on the watch, and thrash it. These threats, the doings of some clerks, have not been repeated. It is said, that some patrols of the watch have been beaten. This corps, abused by the mob in the preceding days of tumult, had its blood up, and gave some thrusts with the bayonet in dispersing the unruly."

September 26th.—"The popular follies are still continued, and increased precautions are taken. The Parliament issued a proclamation on the day of their return, against processions, petards, fuses, &c. This proclamation has been set at nought, as well as the King's prohibition; for it must always be remembered that in France, neither the law, nor the power which emanates from it is respected, save in so far as either makes itself feared. No one obeys when he thinks that he can avoid doing so with impunity. These rioters consist of ragamuffins and shoe-blacks, the greater number of whom are from fourteen to sixteen years of age, probably hounded on. None of them offered any resistance, nor were they armed. They were about to burn an effigy of the Queen in the Place Dauphine, which is the reason why such strict regulations were enforced and so many precautions taken. As the Government, always acting inconsistently, had in the first instance sent a number of guards, posted up threatening placards, after-

wards permitted processions and fireworks, and then replaced the guards; these vacillations have encouraged the mob. The ministry did not know what they were doing. The rioters threw a bundle of fireworks upon the pile of arms of sentries at the palace: they were observed and thrashed. They also intercepted on the Quai des Orfèvres a warrant sent to the Maréchal de Biron, and demanded money of the passers-by—to purchase fuses, as they said. They threatened to burn the house of M. Dubois, the captain of the watch: the watch surrounded them, and a great number were killed and wounded by the bayonet: the same thing occurred with the French guards in the Rue de Saint Dominique, where they threatened the hotel of Lamoignon. Upon the following days, there were several skirmishes, among others, upon Sunday the 28th, in the Rue de la Harpe, where a patrol of the French guards were ordered to fire, and killed several persons. The horse-police entered the town some days ago, and have charged the rabble, sword in hand, upon the Pont-Neuf, and dispersed them: some were wounded. At night the rioting, fireworks, and uproar, are continued in various quarters.”

October 1st.—“ This civil war, as some of the newspaper writers term it, is nothing more than a mutiny of rogues and boys, who are paid by some secret agents to make this disturbance. A number of them have been arrested, and all is over. The people, the minor *bourgeoisie*, have not taken the slightest part in these movements. The Parliament has issued a fresh proclamation against the processions and fireworks. It was time that this sort of thing should be stopped; for Paris was without

police, the guards afraid to punish, the town infested with beggars. Thieves stopped passengers in the streets, and demanded money of them; and there were both robberies and assassinations.

“There is a perfect inundation of pamphlets, abusive, meaningless attacks against the new minister. The comedy of “*La Cour plénière*,” is greatly in favour. It is attributed to Rulhière, and to the Marquis de Créquy.”*

November, 1788.—“New assembly of Notables to decide all the questions relating to the convocation of the States General.”

* It is by Gorsas. (Subsequent note of Mallet du Pan). M. Saint-Marc-Girardin attributes the “*Cour plénière*” to an ex-magistrate. “The author is said to be M. Duveyrier, who died First-President of the Imperial Court of Montpellier. I do not think that he has written any other pieces.”—*Essai de littérature et de morale*, v. i. p. 147.

CHAPTER VII.

1789—1792.

Articles upon the English Constitution published in the “*Mercure de France*” before the meeting of the States General—Opinions of Mallet du Pan upon the first acts of the Constituent Assembly—Position and character of the “*Mercure*” after the suppression of the censorship.

THE Revolution now drew near, or rather it had already taken place; for when an absolute monarchy confesses its incapacity, it forfeits the tenure of its existence: even before having given place to another form of government, the old monarchy no longer possessed any influence in France. The convocation of the States General, so long refused and at last consented to in despair, had, as has been already observed,* a significance far other than that of a mere financial expedient. The French nation, in a state of commotion throughout its whole extent, was not about to charge their representatives with the sole care of reorganizing the dilapidated fortunes of the state, when the royal power itself had only just delivered up these prerogatives to their mercy. In 1788, Mallet du Pan, in

* Mignet's “*Tableau de la Révolution Française.*”

one of the notes of his diary, had noted down the expression of his astonishment at what was going on around him: "It must be remarked," writes he, "that few nations have been in a more favourable situation for giving themselves a free constitution, than the French. The Court has tried every measure, the nation not one. Assembly of notables, publicity of the finances, agreement to give up the subsidies to the States General, &c.—all has been done by the Court through political fatherhood, embarrassment, or ignorance." Thus, when more serious men come to consider the question thoroughly, how will it be possible for the Government any longer to evade it? It is perhaps one of the misfortunes of the French Revolution, that it had been so long effected in men's minds, before the moment when it suddenly appeared triumphant and almost intoxicated with success. It has therefore come to pass, that the ideas and wishes of moderate politicians find themselves obsolete on the very day of their appearance. There was but one point in the history of the Constituent Assembly for men who would have been able to save France at the same time from monarchical despotism and popular tyranny.

It was with the efforts of these pre-eminently wise and enlightened minds, that the political career of Mallet du Pan was connected. It was also to his honour that, during his laborious life, he should, in the midst of the dangers and discouragements of that perilous time, have carried on arguments with men of eloquence, while supporting with his pen those principles of which they were the defenders in the Constituent Assembly.

It was evident that the Genevese journalist was indig-

nant at the misdeeds and weaknesses of the Court. He had demanded from France and from its King, the establishment of a government which would place the nation, as well as its head, in such a position that they should necessarily respect each other, and unite their efforts and their interests in the government of the country. Far from entering into the chimeras of the "Contrat Social," he trusted to the inherent merits of representative government so detested by Rousseau; but his good sense enabled him to perceive the difficulties and inconveniences of close imitation in political government, and therefore he did not so much desire to see the English constitution adopted in France, as the general principles upon which it was founded. The provinces sent to the States General many men who shared these opinions; but it was already too late. The lessons afforded by the constitution and history of England had failed, equally with the precepts of Montesquieu, to counteract, in the mind of the French people, the intoxicating effects of those democratic notions promulgated with so much authority by J. J. Rousseau, and to which the revolution in North America had given such formidable support.

The work of De Lolme upon the English constitution, published in 1770, and very soon spread throughout Europe, was in high esteem in England, while in France it was scarcely read. It was not until about 1788 that it began to attract any attention, and then probably had found more opponents than partizans. Such at least was the opinion of Mallet, who, on the eve of the opening of the States General, published in the "Mercure" those remarkable articles upon the work of De Lolme, which are

in themselves a substantial and suggestive exposition of that English constitution, which would naturally be an object of interest. His intention was not so much to extol the British constitution, as to contrast it with those democratic prejudices and immature theories of which he had perceived the danger and probably foresaw and dreaded the triumph.

"The reader of this book," says he, in speaking of De Lolme's work, "requires a preliminary knowledge of the system of mixed governments, and, above all, a mind free from prejudices: there is one which, during the last ten years, has been authorized by an infinity of declamatory writings, namely, that liberty consists in democracy alone,—that a people is enslaved, or about to become so, in all cases where it ceases to exercise of itself the functions of sovereignty, where it does not appear as the centre, the administrator, the supreme judge, the constant reformer of all functions ; in all cases where, after having created and sanctioned the fundamental laws, it imposes, by a wise equilibrium, limits on its own despotism, and ensures the stability of its institutions. To demonstrate the folly of this prejudice by experience, by argument, by the actual example of England, is the principal object of this work, which is honoured with the approbation of that free and enlightened nation the government of which it expounds."

Since the time that Mallet had made it his object, in editing the "*Annales*," to present the current history of the century, of its manners and opinions, he had not ceased, as we have seen, to follow attentively the course of political opinions ; no work upon subjects of social philosophy escaped his meditative perusal, nor any symptom of the

state of the public mind ; and it was on this account that, although intensely interested in the imminent reform of the political government of France upon the eve of the opening of those States General, the object of universal hope, he was almost the only member of the press who dreamt of throwing out the anchor of safety, and who did not allow himself to be carried away by general enthusiasm and improvidence. He guards by anticipation against dangers which the enthusiasm of the times refuses to dread or even to credit, and which unhappily were too near at hand. Thus certain chapters of De Lolme are recommended by him as furnishing the refutation of a doctrine contained in various modern books, "the authors of which," he observes, "hating permanence in any institution, incite the people to create in order to destroy afterwards ; to reform its government annually ; to respect its own caprices and transitory opinions far more than the laws ; and to think itself lost as soon as it shall cease to live amid the ruins of its own authority."

"J. J. Rousseau," continues Mallet, "has laid it down in the '*Contrat Social*,' with trenchant brevity, that the English people becomes enslaved at the moment of electing members of Parliament. The arguments by which M. de Lolme refutes this strange assertion will be irresistibly conclusive to all who have, like him, seen the multitude act : always without adequate information, without perseverance ; incapable of deliberate resolution, and disqualified for resisting by itself the more united and clear-sighted combination of the ambitious concerned in the administration. If the people wishes to defend itself successfully against them, it must adopt their uniform, their

serried phalanx, their arms, their tactics, the evolutions of which cannot be the principle of a great aggregation of men. 'It would be wiser,' says M. de Lolme, 'to pass laws by the throw of the dice than by the votes of a mob.*' This will explain how it is that the word liberty has been and continues to be so much abused, by applying it to the exercise of the national rights by the voice of the nation as a body. The latter is in possession of power only in order to resign it to another, either voluntarily or passively; its blind favour elevates to a position of unlimited power those men who ultimately betray, after having affected to defend it; and who, from being the principal adversaries of usurpation, become usurpers themselves."

"The annals of republics present to our view a multitude of useless troubles, of civil wars without effect, of popular convulsions afterwards tranquillized by measures which served only further to dismember the state. There is no doubt that Machiavelli had these facts in his mind when he said: 'Il popolo sempre perdè nelle rivolte.' But England always presents the opposite result; that is to say, revolutions by which all classes of the people have really and equally profited."

Mallet wrote thus at the approach of the convocation of the States General; but before this event took place, the

* This observation deserves attention, as coming from an author who in the penultimate disturbances at Geneva, in 1768, was one of the most highly respected and enlightened of the popular party. However, the conduct of that party, at the period in question, was far from justifying this too sweeping denunciation of the multitude.

---*Note by Mallet du Pan.*

fickleness of the French mind, changing every instant the subjects of its agitations and its desires, had led the journalist to doubt whether anything serious would come of it. His private diary gives us the expression of these alternatives of doubt, fear and distrust. In November, 1788, he says :

“ The violent, *bizarre* and anarchical writings still continue. Their authors want, in the space of a few months, to attain perfection in government ; to transform an absolute monarchy into a republic, and to set a great example to free states. No two opinions, no two ideas, no two plans, are in accordance in this multitude of pamphlets. They assemble together without order, and in defiance of orders, in the different provinces ; every one’s brain is heated with arguing and talking nonsense, deciding and disputing. Instead of making evident to the different classes of the country their common interests, they make it their study to expose conflicting interests—to exasperate them against each other—to effect a schism between the people and the two other classes. They have succeeded. The excessive abuse of power had led to the actual crisis, the host of demands and agitations have rendered it fruitless. It is quite possible that, after all this ado and this discord, the deputies will enter the States General wearied out with eternal debating.”

In January, 1789, this reflection occurs :

“ Public discussion has changed its aspect. It no longer troubles itself except secondarily with the King, with despotism, or with the constitution : it has become a war between the third estate and the two other classes, against whom the Court has stirred up the towns. The Parlia-

ment was an idol six months back ; now every one detests and insults it : Epr  mesnil, the avenger of the nation, the Brutus of France, on whom they had lavished their enthusiasm, is vilified everywhere. This is what in France is called the noble empire of opinion.

“The clergy and the aristocracy, by offering resistance to the Crown, have exempted themselves from taxation ; the people should have done so as well. In our time, they desire to load these two orders with chains, instead of striking them off all.”

At length, on the 5th of May, 1789, the States General were opened at Versailles. The diary of Mallet, broken off at this period, does not unfortunately offer any trace of the impressions which he experienced, nor of the opinions which he entertained of the first acts of the Revolution ; and (the “*Mercur*e” still subject to the censor) he continued to give statements of events in few words and without comment. Nevertheless, his subsequent opinions upon the initiatory proceedings of the Constituent Assembly, admit of the conjecture that the energy of the third estate reconciled him in the first instance to the national character of which he had given up all hope, from seeing it possess so little solidity and coherence. The French seriously wishing to give themselves a constitution ! Mallet could not view with indifference an impulse long the object of his wishes.

“No one,” he declares in one place, “no one has desired the success of this noble enterprise with a more dis-interested ardour. What opponent would presume to regard with a malevolent eye the spectacle of a great nation, the monarch of which himself proclaims constitu-

tional principles, while its various representatives, actuated by an unanimous desire, bring to bear upon the general interests of the empire precepts almost uniform; of a nation, which, while advancing towards freedom with dignity and circumspection, should wisely make its rights conform to those of the authorities to which it confided their exercise; should make its liberty consist in the harmony of the different powers, and remove abuses without undermining public justice and order.”* ·

It remains to ascertain what that constitution would be, and if the journalist was not in this respect without

* Some years afterwards, Mallet made the following remarks upon the subject of the first steps of the Revolution: “The errors of the Court have been as numerous as those of the nobility. Instead of leaving undecided the question of the orders, instead of leaving them to themselves, the King ought, on the first day of their division, to have presented himself before the Assembly, and declared to all that he would postpone its opening until such time as they should be in accordance; that he had not convoked them for mere disputation; and that he undertook to secure their co-operation by a treaty, and establish that treaty by amicable conference, before their passions and projects were developed. On the contrary, they were left to themselves, the nobility to their pride and prejudice, the Tiers to the factious who wished for trouble and discord. The truly revolting manner in which the deputies were repulsed, wholly without warning, before the sitting of the 23rd of June, when they attended the session, was another enormous fault. It is not generally known that, when assembled at the Jeu de Paume, all the leaders having left, the Abbé Sieyès attempted to profit by this excitement by proposing that the Assembly should immediately transfer itself to Paris, there constitute itself, and legislate in the name of the nation. This idea met with approbation. The Abbé Sieyès, surrounded by his adherents, was about to move the resolution, when Mounier, in order to parry the blow, proposed the oath of unison pending the passing of the

uneasiness, he was not without hope. But the taking of the Bastille—or rather the occurrences of the 14th of July, which caused so much enthusiasm, even in those circles of society where they ought to have spread dismay—put an end to his hopes. This prison, so fatal to the French monarchy, was so much the type of despotism, that our republican, who participated with all men of letters in a detestation of it, could not view its fall with regret. But the way in which the people had conducted themselves at that attack, the indecision and weakness of the authorities, and, finally, the horrors of the victory—in short, the general attitude of the people—all this filled him with a profound grief; and while on all sides in the saloons into which the enthusiasm had penetrated, this memorable day was eulogised, Mallet openly predicted that it would prove to be the precursor of the greatest calamities. But no more attention was paid to him than to that Cassandra, whose part he was perpetually destined to play. Although Mallet seldom imparted his political anxieties to his family, his children have preserved a strong recollection of the profound melancholy which the scenes at the Bastille cast over him.

The Revolution, by doing away with the censorship, and giving free scope to the press, restored to Mallet his liberty of opinion, and the “*Mercure*,” being emancipated, presented from the month of August, 1789, the

constitution. It was therefore a compulsory measure on his part, and under the circumstances, indispensable.”—The latter particulars seem to have been disclosed by Mounier at the time when Mallet was in frequent communication with the ex-President of the Constituent Assembly, who like himself had retired to Berne.

singular contrast of a journal violently revolutionary in one section, and energetically conservative in the other. M. de Chateaubriand has remarked in his "Mémoires" this fact, as being one among the thousand contradictions which Paris presented at that time. "Mallet du Pan," says he, "was in the political portion of the 'Mercure,' in opposition to La Harpe and Champfort in the literary part of the same journal." Moreover, the political interest of the "Mercure" preponderated so much over its literary interest, that ere long the political journal absorbed that moiety of the space which had hitherto been reserved to the other. At the same time, and in spite of the increasing restriction of private means, the number of its subscribers augmented considerably. They rose in 1790 to eleven thousand, and increased to thirteen thousand; perhaps we should triple this amount to arrive at a just appreciation of their high estimation of the paper at that time. If other proofs are required to show the immense authority of the "Mercure" at the time of the Revolution, it will suffice to adduce the testimony of Mirabeau himself, who, upon one occasion, alluded to it in the Assembly as the *most able and the most widely circulated of the journals*.*

* "Mémoires de Mirabeau," published by M. Lucas de Montigny, vol. VII, p. 549. Mallet had said in the "Mercure" (No. 2, January 9th, 1790): "For a long time the National Assembly has been split into three sections, that called the *enragés*, that denominated the *aristocrats*; thirdly, the *moderates*, who have never changed since their origin, being equally distant from aristocracy and anarchy, from despotism and democracy. The party called aristocratic, has already in a great measure amalgamated with these last. The first of these three sections, which we may now consider reduced to two, having instituted a club and some private assemblies in the Jacobin

This success was merited not solely from the accuracy and exactness of the news and reports which were presided over without intermission by the inflexible conscientiousness of the editor. The tried independence of Mallet, an independence of character and not of calculation, insured to his opinions a consideration which none of his colleagues at all approached. With decisive opinions and principles, which united him to the moderate constitutionalists and even to the royalists, as much as they separated him from the revolutionary and republican parties in the Assembly, he never curtailed the remarks or the reproaches which the levity or unskilfulness of the monarchists appeared to him to merit; and we shall see that the royalists never resorted to him except to avert a worse evil. His probity and his courage in the breach awed them in spite of themselves; his austere virtue and political sagacity irritated them

club-house of Rue Saint-Honoré, the two others followed this example, in order to lay down their plan of proceeding also." These somewhat obscure phrases import that many aristocrats of the Assembly had united with the moderates to form a club after the fashion of the *enragés*. It is difficult to put any other meaning upon the words; but Mirabeau was pleased to discover in them an impertinence, and an affirmation that the *aristocrats* and the *moderates* had approved of the opinions which originated with the sect of the *enragés*. He therefore prepared a denunciation of the "*Mercur*," to serve as a salutary warning to other journals. "A stop," said he, "must be put to this insolence, without interfering with the freedom of the press," and he suggested "that the author of the political department of the '*Mercure*' and the proprietor of that journal, be summoned to the bar, and censured by the President." But, pacified or better advised, Mirabeau relinquished his proposed denunciation, which saw the light for the first time in the work of M. Lucie de Montigny.

and made him feared. Abroad his popularity was great, as well as in the provinces, where his journal was looked for with an eager impatience; for the "Mercure," almost alone of the whole press, dared to publish the complaints sent from the departments, and the statement of the excesses of which they were the theatre. The sole authentic organ of the opinions of the moderate party, in its pages were to be found the speeches of Mounier, Malouet and their friends, to which the intolerant majority of the galleries would not listen; it was in the "Mercure" also that it was possible to appreciate the impressions which foreigners, especially the English, entertained upon the French Revolution.

We have not, under the pretext of following Mallet through these events, an inopportune intention of recommencing the history of the Revolution; but the object of these Memoirs would be almost sacrificed if the principal occasions were not pointed out in which Mallet du Pan signalized his courage and superiority as an historian and a journalist; if some of those opinions were not recalled which are most worthy of notice, and those traits indicated which gave to his journal its importance and its originality.

No historian, whatever his candour or his power of representing events, would be able to picture to us the French Revolution with so much truthfulness and eloquence as the simple parliamentary chronicle of the different assemblies which succeeded each other, after the day of the Jeu de Paume. An historical manner, summaries and broad delineations, may suffice to give an interest to the picture of the Revolution, and to systematize its results; but to comprehend the character and coherency of the

acts brought forth during that long delirium of politics, intoxicated with phrases and with daring innovations, it is necessary to have played an active part in these wordy storms, in these terrible conflicts of opinions, of passions and of interests. It is then that Providence is recognised through these events. We have evidence which shows the play of all the human faculties engaged in this violent struggle; there is no more mystery—the true secret of the victories and the defeats is obtained; and if poetry loses much by this broad daylight thrown upon it, reason profits and gathers instruction which encourages it for the future against the necessity of crimes and catastrophes.

It is in the contemporary accounts—even although exposed to the risk of involuntary or intentional misrepresentations—that the parliamentary history of the Revolution should be traced; only it is necessary to guard against highly coloured accounts, which are worse than the rude bluntness of excitement. Garat, who reported the sittings of the National Assembly in the “*Journal de Paris*,” was greatly admired. The following passage will show with what a politic colouring, naively praised by himself, his patriotism invested the eloquence of the constituents; it is also remarkable in other respects:

“You know, Sir, (Garat is addressing this effusion to Condorcet in 1792), that at that very time the sittings of the National Assembly, from whence all the measures proceeded, and from whence all was to have been proclaimed and re-echoed, were far less deliberations than actions and incidents. It is now no longer objectionable to say so: those tumultuous sittings were less combats of opinion than combats of passions; cries rather than debates were

heard there; they appeared more likely to terminate in personal violence than in decrees. Often, when about to write my report on leaving those sittings, which were protracted so far into the night, and losing in the darkness and silence of the streets of Versailles or Paris the agitations in which I had partaken, I have felt that if anything was able to arrest and drive back the Revolution, it was a picture of those sittings traced by a mind and by a pen known to be free. Ah! Sir, how I have longed to do it, and how culpable I should have been if I had! I was convinced that all was lost, both our liberty and the better hopes of the human race, if the National Assembly ceased for one moment to be in the eyes of the nation an object worthy of its respect, of its love and of its hopes. All my endeavours were therefore directed to present the truth, but without rendering it terrible; of that which had been nothing more than a tumult, I made a picture; I sought and seized in these convulsions of the sanctuary of law those traits which had a character and an interest for the imagination. I prepared the mind to assist at a kind of dramatic performance rather than at a sitting of legislators; I described the actors before introducing them on the stage; I represented all their sentiments, but not always with the same expressions; of their exclamations I made sallies; of their furious gesticulations, attitudes; and when I was unable to inspire esteem I strove to cause emotion."

Mallet du Pan understood his functions as a reporter of the sittings in a different manner; it will suffice to hear him:

"Contemporaries and posterity ought undoubtedly to

judge an assembly by their acts, and not by their discourses; they would in that case follow the example of history and law which restrict themselves to pronouncing upon the actions of men. However, it is incumbent upon us in the annals of the age, to record, together with the resolutions, the motives which have determined them, and the struggle of opinions in the midst of which they have floated.

“The character of an assembly is not determined by three or four speeches alone, although these leading speeches enlist a great number of suffrages; it is by the general friction of many opinions differently discussed that the observer appreciates the nature of the deliberation. To become acquainted with the spirit of it, it must be presented in all its aspects, and a vicious argument holds its place in the representation as well as an instructive truth.

“The facts alone, related with accuracy, arranged with order, divested of the amplification inseparable from verbal eloquence—this is what history must one day consult, what the public expect, and what we owe them.

“True in other respects to the plan which we proposed to ourselves at the commencement, we shall never lose sight of the precept of Tacitus: ‘*Præcipuum munus annalium reor, ne virtutes sileantur, utque pravis dietis, factisque ex posteritate et infamia metus sit.*’”

So long as Mallet was able to hold the pen himself, he never for a single instant swerved from this programme, conceived rather in the spirit of an historian than of a journalist; it was only when summing up opinions, that he was more and more compelled to classify them, and to

characterize them by hasty notes. A fortunate necessity, by which his reports gained in interest and value.

Between 1789 and 1792, in the two earliest assemblies, it is known how many men passed from popularity to scorn or hatred, from the Capitol to the Tarpeian rock—to adopt the words of Mirabeau descriptive of that fearful rapidity which at the time whirled round the wheel of fortune. It is known what sudden light then fell all at once upon the chiefs of parties at the moment of their fall; what a return they then made towards those principles which they had repulsed with impatience in order to strengthen their advantages and establish their victory. Mallet, a witness of these sudden revulsions, and after having had too much firmness to pass with an equal abruptness from censure to eulogy; intrigue being at the same time so much mixed up in the measures of parties—Mallet was fully justified in his distrust of the motives which restrained as well as those which urged on the various factions of the Assembly. In these days such austerity appears too severe: its sincerity has been sufficiently proved, but his resentment of the first injury then carried him away to make futile attempts to obtain a tardy reparation, and indignation closed his heart against a generous pardon. This difficulty of pardoning is a fault in politics as in morals; it is also an injustice. All minds are not prepared to receive persuasion at the same time; for the tardy, the delay is a misfortune, but if both finally arrive at the same goal, the period of the arrival must not be taken into account. There is no legitimate contempt but for those who, setting out on the right course, voluntarily turn their backs upon the object before them, and for those who are determined never to reach it

We shall afterwards have proofs that the severity of Mallet du Pan was not the effect of intolerance or of obstinacy; and it must indeed be admitted that in a similar case the indulgence granted to an individual should not be afforded in the same degree to a journalist, whose duty it was to direct public opinion.

As for the considerations which suggested to Mallet the probable course of events and the progress of the Revolution, he generally stated them in lengthy articles, collections of which deserve an important place in the library of all political men, since they contain precise views and reflections applicable to the government of nations.

After this preliminary exposition of the manner in which the editor of the "Mercure" represented in his journal the opinions of the most enlightened and respectable portion of the French nation, it is time to follow Mallet through the various phases of that tumultuous career.

CHAPTER VIII.

1789—1790.

Opinions of Mallet in the “*Mercur de France*” from 1789 to 1792
 —Declaration of the rights of man—Scenes at Versailles (October 5th and 6th)—Flight of Mounier; retirement of Lally-Tollendal
 —Mallet du Pan threatened—His relations with Malouet become more intimate—Injustice of the majority—Declamations on the right—Civic oath—Provisional law on the liberty of the press.

WHEN the Constituent Assembly, broaching questions which hitherto had occupied none but philosophers, asked whether the constitution ought not to be preceded by a declaration of generic rights, Mallet du Pan made known his opinions upon the subject in a short essay, the energetic brevity of which will admit of its being almost quoted at length :

“The rights of man insure to him the free exercise of his faculties, physical and moral: whence results necessarily an inequality of rights proportional to those of his faculties. The superiority of power, of intelligence, and dexterity, give rise to the dominion of one man over another, and so long as the human species remains in that primitive state

it remains subject to differences which Nature herself has made between individuals. Thus the bushes bow beneath the oak, and the herrings are devoured by the whales. Take this example of the rights of nature.

“Society substitutes a conventional right; it levels inequalities by the establishment of political equality: this could never be anything but ideal without laws which determine its application and insure its maintenance. These laws alone are the rights of the social man and those of the community of which he is a member. If he arrogated others, such a pretension would become general—society would be dissolved.

“The rights of the individual are therefore inseparable from those of the citizen, since it is only by this latter right that he is removed from the natural superiority of physical and moral powers. Positive laws determine his condition, his prerogatives, and their limits: there cannot now remain to him, under penalty of entering into opposition with his fellow-men, any other rights than those which have been sanctioned by general society. Consequently to declare the rights of man is to declare the laws a futility; for truth itself does not bind the citizen, except in so far as it is related to an actual institution: the noblest maxims will never have in the social system the force of a police regulation. . . .

“When, in 1688, the English drew up their famous bill of rights, they were perfectly well acquainted with the rights of man in general; for ten years in succession they had developed them under the reign of Charles I. A hundred parliamentary speeches, a hundred writings appealed to these metaphysical principles: they were all

contained in the famous work of Marchmont Needham, published in 1656.* However, the Parliament contented itself with declaring the laws whose violations it repaired, and the new laws which it enacted.

“The Americans have followed another course ; but it is in their charters, and not in their parliamentary declarations, that the present generation or the following will find the principles of their liberty and the means of defending it.”

Some days afterwards, Mallet added to this succinct theory other remarks deduced from common sense : they presented a singular contrast to the metaphysics which were then lavished at the tribune and in hundreds of writings :

“The Evangelist has given the most simple, the most brief, and the most complete declaration of the rights of man, where he says : ‘ Do unto others as you would be done unto.’ All natural politics rest on this support, and there is nothing more fertile than this maxim, which defines the limits of the rights of man and of his duties.

“It strikes all ages and all minds : a porter fathoms its meaning and application as well as a metaphysician. Every law of liberty rests upon it, or is imperfect in departing from it.

“The law alone disciplines nature, and seconds it by subordinating to it all the aristocracies of birth, power, riches, authority, and by perfectly equalizing the political distribution of good and evil. The constitution is the

* “This singular book is entitled : ‘The excellency of free state, or the right constitution of a commonwealth.’ Rousseau’s ‘Contrat Social’ seems but a tame and timid extract from this book, which was nevertheless quite unknown to my celebrated countryman.”

key-stone of this edifice of factitious equality and liberty. It must act as a guarantee to it; but this great work of the perfected human mind has no precedent whatever in the primitive condition of mankind.

“ These ideas, which are simply opinions, and which we take it on ourselves to spread because they are in nowise dangerous, may serve as an introduction to the important debates which again occupied the National Assembly last week.”

One of the mistakes of opinion during the French Revolution was, the setting up Rousseau as an authority, and his “*Contrat Social*” as a political gospel. Mallet had to point out, over and over again, how greatly and variously, on the contrary, the philosopher’s doctrines were departed from.

“ ‘ The English nation,’ says Rousseau, ‘ thinks itself free; it is much mistaken. It is so only during the election of members of Parliament. As soon as they are elected, it is enslaved—it is nothing. The absurd notion of representatives is modern; it comes to us from the iniquitous feudal government!’ It is then because the English Government is representative that Rousseau deemed the English slaves; and thus every nation under the representative system would be in slavery like them. The authority of Rousseau, therefore, is inadmissible, in an assembly of delegates of the people. This celebrated author persisted to the close of his life in his aversion to representative government, writing: ‘ I see no alternative between the sternest democracy and the most absolute Hobbism.’ ”

Meanwhile, the Assembly, hurried on in the universal

excitement, was beginning to abandon the discussion of fundamental principles, and soon recurred to them only at long intervals. The famous night of the 4th of August, which was the triumph of that enthusiastic sensibility, the favourite virtue of the eighteenth century; that night when the nobility besieged the tribune, to sacrifice all its privileges with religious emulation, when, amid the “annates” and the special dues of the provinces, “a nobleman demanded, like Catullus, to offer his sparrow,” in sacrificing his dove-cotes to the rural population—that memorable sitting not only imparted a rapid impetus to the Revolution, but it carried away that basis of deliberation and legislative calmness always slight enough in France, and struck a heavy blow at the respect for rights and the forms of legality.

From this moment, the feverish impatience of the parties agglomerated in Paris rose against every obstacle; and intolerance of opinion was let loose with all the fanaticism of which it is susceptible, against those who strove to urge on the legislature the experience of history and the lessons of great political minds. A crowd of pamphleteers stimulated this impatience, heaping insult and even at this early period threats, on their more calm, or well-informed fellows. Mallet strenuously denounced this new despotism. In the month of September, being accused in Brissot’s paper, of being a “bloodsucker,” he wrote :

“At a time when all abuses are struck down, it is necessary to denounce one which, above all others, threatens personal liberty and security. For some time past, a class of writers has been urging all its opinions as axioms, its decisions as oracles, its statements as legal documents. If one adopts other ideas—nay, if one suggests a doubt, or

proposes a modification, some furious organ of despotism denounces, rends, calumniates whatever resists it: the slightest contradiction of its doctrine becomes an attack on the primary rights of man. Escaped from the censorial knife, we fall victims to the butchery of intolerance. Opinions are distorted; motives attributed on suspicion; those who cannot be confuted are held up to odium; and perhaps at present there is not a single truly free and independent mind not groaning under this species of oppression. The liberty of the press will be a preservative against it; but, to render that liberty efficacious, we must wait for the empire of liberty of opinion, from which we are yet far distant."

The effects of this fanaticism of the papers soon declared themselves; and Mallet wrote, after the dreadful scenes at Versailles:

"Opinion at the present day dictates its decrees with the sword and rope in its hands. 'Believe or die' is the sentence pronounced by excited spirits: they pronounce it in the name of liberty—but where would this liberty exist without the support of law? How answer for its thoughts and publications? Vainly, amid so many rocks, would be the attempt to take moderation for a guide: *that* has become a crime. Vainly would the public interest and virtue be sincerely aimed at: so many corrupt pens profane those sacred names, that you must either profane them likewise, or drift along between contempt and persecution. Let us, nevertheless, overcome the profound terror which fills the independent and truthful man while mingling his powerful voice with the thunders of the storm, and prosecute the ever-winding task imposed upon us."

Overwhelming was indeed the word. At the time when the National Assembly was debating the question of the royal sanction, Mallet's head was among the proscribed. Four maniacs came to intimate to him at his house, producing their pistols, that his life would answer for what he might dare to write in favour of Mounier's opinion on the veto. He defended it eight days afterwards.* Fresh sentences of proscription, fresh threatening visits, followed the appalling 5th and 6th October, 1789, when he alone dared to trace a faithful picture of what had occurred at Versailles.† But this new crime of the Revolution affected

* "Mercure de France," November, 1790, No. 39.

† In the same memorandum previously quoted, are details obtained from Mounier relative to the days of Versailles :

"During the debates on the veto, M. de la Fayette wrote to Mounier that he would be responsible for whatever blood might flow; he wrote in like manner to the ministers daily threatened in fabricated reports. Duport, Alexandre Lameth, Barnave, and some others, persuaded M. Necker of his danger, and proposed to him the suspensive veto. He adopted it, recanted it under the victorious assaults of Mounier, promised to support in council the absolute sanction, and did the precise contrary.

"On the 5th of October, during the sitting, Mirabeau exhorted the President to adjourn the House, as forty thousand men were advancing from Paris. He insisted strongly. The President replied to him: 'No; I will not adjourn it. I will await this host, and, before we adjourn, it shall kill us at our posts—all of us, observe, M. le Comte.'—'Prettily said, M. le President,' rejoined Mirabeau.

"When the King gave in his unconditional acceptance, he went to his bureau, wrote it with his own hand, and handed it over in tears. The council continued sitting, and could resolve on nothing but submission. Mounier and others proposed the removal, first of the Queen, who declined it, then of the royal family. The body

him far more sensibly than his own danger, by depriving him of two of his chief props, two men in whose opinions he shared, Mounier and Lally-Tollendal, now placed at the

guards and some eight or nine hundred noblemen assembled in the gallery were to escort the party, which would have taken horse, the Queen mounted behind one of the body-guards, another guard carrying the dauphin. The King would have withdrawn and convoked the Assembly at Rouen; the President was resolved, as well as a great number of the deputies, to follow the royal family. A manifesto would have been published relative to the violent attempt of twenty thousand men coming from Paris to force the will and palace of the King; all previous concessions would have been ratified. M. de Saint Priest got the project accepted, and set off with his wife. At two leagues' distance, a courier apprised him that the King had not stirred, and would wait for M. de la Fayette.

"Mounier had previously urged M. Necker to repair with all the ministers to the Assembly, denounce the advance of M. de la Fayette, declare it an illegal act which justified repression by force, call upon the Assembly to prohibit him from advancing, and to declare him a traitor to the State, and guilty of treason against the nation if he persisted. The Assembly could not have declined to do this. M. Necker did not venture to make the attempt.

"M. de la Fayette expected to be stopped and massacred, with his followers, at Sèvres. He was sad and uneasy. 'We shall die horribly and ignominiously,' he said; 'of what use is this mob? Can we count upon it?' He halted at break of day, ate a chicken, made a civilian mount guard, with a soldier by him to keep his courage up, and sent his aide-de-camp to Sèvres. He was relieved from his anxiety when the latter came to tell him that the bridge was free, and he resumed his assurance.

"He had told Mounier that nothing was demanded of the King except the dismissal of the regiment of Flanders, and one word in favour of the cockade. He did his best to reassure him, persecuting him directly and indirectly to adjourn the sitting and seek repose. Mounier was on his legs without eating from nine o'clock to three in the morning, and began to spit blood. (M. de

head of the proscribed, and pointed out for a new popular massacre. Mounier, it is well known, had great difficulty in escaping the assassins who were on the search for him. He was compelled to take refuge in that province of Dauphiné which had deputed him to the States General to lay the foundation of the true principles of liberty.

"His courageous conduct," says Mallet, "his character, his writings, will hand him down to posterity as one of the most distinguished men of our unhappy epoch. After risking his life in Dauphiné, in the defence of the people and liberty; after displaying, in the National Assembly, talents and enlarged views set off by a gentle and pure morality, he has been forced to make his escape from the knife of the assassin.

"His crime is that of believing that royal authority, wisely regulated, is the strongest support of liberty, and that the legislative body should be divided into two houses."*

When the inveteracy of calumny again broke out against Mounier, after his withdrawal to Geneva, where the fanaticism of the Dauphinese had constrained him to seek an asylum, Mallet eloquently branded these assaults on individual liberty:

"Some scribblers of the capital have printed that

"M. de Gouvernet acted very well, and overwhelmed with reproaches and scorn the infamous national guard of Versailles."

The notes from which these details are extracted were regarded as highly authentic by Mallet; he made use of them, among other occasions, for an explanation of the oath of the *Jeu de Paume*, as has been seen at p. 169.

* *Mercure de France*—October, 1789, No. 17.

M. Mounier is giving a course of lectures on public rights at Geneva. He does indeed give one, and a most memorable one, to all public men, by his presence in a foreign land ; a signal example of popular ingratitude, and the fate reserved for whatever citizen would serve the people without sharing in its excesses, without misleading it by cowardly submission, and without being tyrannized over by its blindness. When M. Mounier, seconded by the aspirations and the efforts of many of his countrymen, now equally persecuted, equally calumniated with himself, procured the representation of Dauphiné, brought together its three orders, traced a plan of action for the whole kingdom, and laid down the indispensable bases of liberty, he could scarcely have expected that, a year later, for having refused to violate the principles adopted by his province, he would be forced to quit it, in order to spare it a new crime."

Soon afterwards, Lally-Tollendal also gave in his resignation, and retired to Switzerland. Thus did the vanguard of the upholders of constitutional monarchy disperse before the determined attack of the genius of democratic revolution ; martyrs to reason, whose names were at the head of the too long list of the ingratitude of public opinion to those men of the French Revolution, whose only title to the recollection of posterity is the wisdom of their counsels, the moderation of their actions, and their disinterested aims. They had spared no efforts in advocating, in the Constituent Assembly, the idea of a constitution which would at once save the monarchy and found the rational liberty of the nation. In default of the right, which refused with indignation this road to salvation, the support of Mirabeau, who returned too late to those views, would, at this moment,

have sufficed to decide the victory in their favour. It would have been the salvation of France and the victory of those liberal reforms which Europe needed, and which the Revolution stifled, and will long keep stifled, by the intolerable daring of its tyranny and the frightful injustice of its maxims. It will not be out of place to contrast here the political ideas of this party, Mounier, Lally, Malouet, and of that which was victorious among the fanatics of the Constituent Assembly. We will give Mallet du Pan's own words :

" In advocating the union of the three estates in a primary assembly, this party aimed at defending them against the attacks of the communes, by a conditional union, a positive and obligatory treaty. Such was the literal meaning of the Dauphiné manifestoes, drawn up by the three orders in common ; sacred, consequently, in the eyes of all the deputies of the province, and placing the limitation of sacrifices under the safeguard of the most solemn convention.

" In restoring to the communes the measure of authority, strength and independence, which would have balanced them against the royal power and the first two estates of the monarchy, this third party had no idea of their swamping the public sovereignty and smoothing a path to democracy by destroying pre-existent institutions root and branch. It aimed at reforming the clergy without degrading it, at diminishing its opulence without despoiling it, at extending the blessings of tolerance without stripping the religion of twenty-two millions of Frenchmen of the rights of a national creed.

" It would have considered itself guilty of usurpation and

tyranny, had it laid a finger on individual property under the pretext of public need : it never so much as conceived that philosophic policy which supplies want of skill by a daring injustice, and which ruins whole classes of citizens to save the public weal.

“ Considering the National Assembly as a constituent deputation, subordinate to its commission and to the free consent of the sovereign, it recognized its right to organize, in concert with the King, the institution of the fundamental powers of the State, and consequently disavowed its competence to administer any of such powers.

“ Desiring a revolution according to reason and justice, not by the intervention of a furious multitude and the crimes of anarchy, it did not suspect that this would be conjured up without occasion, to obtain a pretext for investing the constituent body with the totality of public powers, legislation, governmental administration, command, organization of the army, police, superintendence of the finances in detail, and judicial power.

“ They opposed two barriers to the acts of this unexampled sovereignty—the right of ratification by the people, and the right of ratification by the King.

“ According to the system of this party, and in conformity with the immutable basis of every monarchy that would combine the liberty with the wisdom of laws, and the stability of institutions with public tranquillity, the legislative functions were divided, and the executive power strictly concentrated in the person of the monarch.

“ The hereditary succession to the crown and its inviolability in the reigning family were declared, without any assumption of the right of founding them. Not only the

power of the supreme chief, independent and sole executive, was recognized in the sovereign, but also the attributes and the functions of royalty. Consequently, he formally continued an integral portion of the legislative power, in virtue of the necessity of his sanction, and the independence of his absolute negative. Sole representative of the national sovereignty, his pre-eminence over all the other powers was consecrated by forms which insured to him the *prestige* and the succour of opinion. Supreme administrator of justice, he was not excluded from all participation in the choice of magistrates and the prosecution of national crimes. Supreme chief of the executive, his subordinate functionaries were not independent of his legal orders, remaining subject exclusively to nomination by the people and the sole judgment of the legislative body. His authority over the forces of the State was not neutralized by an army absolutely independent, under the title of National Guard, he himself being deprived of the power of even disbanding a regiment in the army of the line. The responsibility of his ministers was to be determined so as to protect law and freedom without enervating the action of government, without so subordinating these agents to the legislature that they should become the slaves of a few demagogues, to bruise with their chains both the King and the nation.

“ In suppressing the representation according to orders, the higher classes of society were indemnified in those distinctions which offend neither liberty, property, nor political equality. It was thought preferable thus to regulate and limit the already existing influence of rank, in order to guard against the disturbances which accompany

their inevitable re-establishment, to preserve the State from the unavoidable and immediate clashing of monarch and people, to interest these intermediate classes in public liberty and the maintenance of the constitution—to temper, in fine, the insolent and base aristocracy of riches without birth, without merit, without honourable emulation, without national feeling.

“ As a great empire cannot, without the gravest objections, exist unprovided with great tribunals, supreme courts of justice were contemplated, where the magistrate would maintain the dignity necessary to the importance of his functions. Juries were added in criminal cases—but true juries, always peers of the suitors ; and if a net income of twenty pounds sterling in land is exacted in English juries, thirty would have been required in a country where the national character and the novelty of the institution called for a higher security.

“ For the all-powerful consideration that France is an agricultural country, and that the owners of land alone possess a sovereign interest in the maintenance of law and order, bear the chief burden of public expenditure, and are exclusively endowed with the character of independence essential to the delegates of the nation, to them alone was confided the function of representing it, and the power of constituting its assembled delegates a House of Commons.

“ The fuel of demagogism, the plague of the abuse of eloquence in an assembly, the insensate excitement of debate, the tyranny of a majority, and the inevitable usurpation of a single assembly, the exclusive representative of the pretended general will, were counteracted by estab-

lishing a regulating body, a higher house reserved for the elective deputies of the clergy and the nobility, and for citizens of whatever rank, eminent for great services, or large property, called by the King to this senatorial magistracy. . . .

“ For two months, August and September, 1789, the party whose doctrine we have just analysed, counterbalanced the attempts of the democrats and supported the first two orders under their sacrifices. The majority of the committee on the constitution and two ministers (the Archbishop of Bordeaux and M. de Saint Priest) had caught at this last relic of the wreck; but a portion of the clergy and the nobility almost unanimously rejected it. A plan so moderate, so well adapted to diminish the disasters of the Revolution, and to ward off universal disorganization, suited still less the professors of anarchy, the republicans and conspirators. The crimes advisedly committed in the month of October, and the arrival of the Assembly at Paris, consummated the overthrow of this party, far more odious to the revolutionists, and more dreaded, than the first two orders.

“ Without a head, without a plan of action, wanting entirely in concert of opinion, its powers of adhesion could not resist the treason of a portion of the ministry, the weakness of the Court, the incensed feelings of the two ruined orders, the intrigues of the factious, the invasion by the multitude of the Assembly's deliberations. When pikes and daggers had become the arbiters of our laws, M. Mounier, de Lally, the venerable Bishop of Langres, and many others, whose integrity equalled their sagacity, remembered the fine lines of Addison :

“ When impious men bear sway
The post of honour is a private station.’ ”*

After this retirement of two of its leaders, the rest of the party merged into the right side, although preserving its own opinions. Malouet remained conspicuous, almost alone: well nigh isolated amid the various fractions of the Assembly, he naturally sympathised with the writer of the “*Mercur*,” who had already, during the debates on the royal sanction, expressed his opinion at length, and partaken by reaction, with the late superintendent of marine, the indignation and threats he had brought on himself. “ I recognize myself nowhere but in your paper,” the latter had written to him. A friendship, never afterwards interrupted, was then formed between these kindred and superior spirits.

The duties which each had imposed on himself were becoming meanwhile more arduous and dangerous day by day. Neither of them resisted. While Malouet in the Assembly, amid tumult which generally drowned his voice, answered denunciation with denunciation, the intolerance of parties with an appeal to the rights of freedom, Mallet unremittingly denounced the crimes, the nefarious projects, the false maxims of the revolutionists, as well as the weakness of the men called to oppose the growing anarchy. He pointed out to the latter the inconsistency of their acts in this same month of October:

“ The Assembly of the representatives of the people has also published a reassuring address to the municipalities of the realm, and intends to circulate a similar exhortation

* “*Mercur*,” October, 1791, No. 40.

to the people of Paris. Hitherto but little effect has followed these admonitions, where maxims of extreme danger, in these incendiary times, are indiscriminately mixed up with useful truths. When, for example, the people are reminded in every paragraph that they are absolutely sovereign, it is absurd to dissuade them by unmeaning phrases, from exercising their sovereignty at their own good pleasure. These are but drops of water cast into the mouth of a volcano.

“What would be much better worth impressing on the people—could we entertain the slightest hope of being heard—is, that the altar of freedom rests on two bases, justice and virtue.”*

Every day and every sitting of the Assembly summoned the editor of the “*Mercure*” to uphold his principles in reference and opposition to the acts of all parties. If, on the one side, he had to comment on the fatal and violent insinuations of the Lameths and Barnave, the errors of Mirabeau, their opponent, and the maxims of M. Robespierre, the profound enemy of all, it was necessary also to repress the sometimes inopportune sallies of Maury and Montlosier, and occasionally the indiscretions of Cazalès. It was necessary also to denounce the infamous libels of the friends of the left, and censure the declamations of the partizans of the right. About this time Mallet set forth candidly the state of matters. To the impetuous enemies of the Revolution, he said:

“The principles of the Revolution have become law. They were imperatively demanded by the abuses of all kinds under which France has groined ever since the

* “*Mercure de France*,” October, 1789, No. 43.

reign of Louis XIV. The King, the National Assembly, the ministers, have ratified a new order of government. A very large number of good citizens, who, while applauding the re-establishment of public liberty, censure the gratuitous violence by which it has been accompanied; who deplore the prolongation of an anarchy which there is nothing to necessitate, and lament that the royal authority should be powerless to accelerate its termination; who, disapproving some of the principles on which the constitution has been founded, would themselves found it on principles equally liberal, while further limiting their application; ensuring to the laws that conservative energy which results from the interest of all the powers, so as to maintain them inviolable; these citizens, we say, would revolt against the old despotism so soon as it won back to itself dangerous proselytes. In conformity with these principles, which we have ourselves professed, and which we shall unchangeably profess, every reflective mind will condemn those aggressive writings dictated by passion, when the National Assembly is outraged by clamours, as so many others outrage it by their servile adulation.”*

On the occasion of the civic oath, he again insists on the necessity and duty of rendering obedience to the constitution,—an obedience which, to his thinking, did not at all exclude the right of examination and disapproval. Wise citizens submit—so far as obedience is concerned—to the decrees of the national power: slaves alone submit to these their conscience and their judgment. He, therefore, exhorted his friends to take the civic oath.

This impartiality had no effect on the factious, who

* “*Mercur de France*,” January, 1799, No. 1.

detested nothing so much as moderation, and already entertained contempt and almost hatred for the constitution: Mallet was none the less assailed, as before, with calumny, insult and threats. A Barnave, a Lameth, joined this concert of maniacs. He then considered that, being brought personally in question, he had a right to speak of and for himself:

“In order to love liberty sincerely,” says he, “it is requisite to have enjoyed it: to recognize it amid the artifices of ambition and the illusions of system-mongering, it is requisite to have known its excesses as well as its blessings: to define its limits, it is necessary to have been taught by experience the dangers into which states plunge, which are so imprudent as to force those sacred barriers which law, justice, wisdom, interpose between the power of the people and its obedience; between the maintenance of legitimate authority and the hatred of all authority; between the virtues of the citizen and that hypocritical subservience to the people which may inveigle the reason and esteem of a whole nation.

“Born in a republic, having had before my eyes for twenty years the spectacle of all the passions which harass freedom—of political fanaticism, party-spirit, the abuse of terms, and public calamity, the sole result of these storms,—I have at least learned to mistrust sweeping opinions, systematizing experiments, violence, injustice, the perverse or perverted judgments born amid even necessary revolutions, as noxious insects are hatched in the summer sun. It is not at forty years of age, that a rational republican, who has dragged twenty of them through political

tempests, will render himself the accomplice of the passions of any one whatever.”*

At the end of the month of January, 1790, the Abbé Sieyès proposed to the National Assembly a law on the press, which had long been wanted. The “*Mercur*,” after having observed that this law, of all laws the most difficult to render efficient even in quiet times, was proposed at a moment when laws most easily enforced were powerless, or a dead letter, presented in his turn reflections on the subject, first finding fault with the law of Sieyès as being merely provisional :

“It is remarked,” says he, “that a provisional law and an ineffectual one, are unfortunately synonymous, especially at an epoch when all authority is shaken. A provisional law is indicative of the irresolution of the legislator ; it marks a distrust of his own wisdom, of the inviolability of his decision, of the obedience he exacts. The public, particularly its dangerous portions, soon dive into his sentiments ; the administrators of the law share in them, criminals take advantage of them, and consider themselves tolerably secure of impunity. In my opinion also, the liberty of the press and the punishment of its abuse, rest on unchangeable principles, which it is dangerous to compound with, and the application of which must be unalterably fixed by the legislator, leaving it to the police to relax their severity, under circumstances of too threatening a nature. . . .

“So penetrating and reflective a mind as that of M. l’Abbé Sieyès,” adds Mallet, “would not be ignorant of

* “*Mercur de France*, ’ January, 1790, No. 5.

the true principles of the liberty of the press ; so universal is the sway of enlightened reason, that his maxims prove identical with those of Blackstone, Hume, De Lolme, and of all the writers whose opinions command the respect of Europe.”*

But the experimentalist doubted the efficacy of the proposed plans ; and after having established the theory and practice which prevailed in England in regard to the liberty of the press, Mallet concludes by the following reflection, which, though it may appear common-place, is decisive as to the political question :

“The best safeguard of the liberty of the press, the most efficient barrier against its abuse, is the morality of authors ; not morality in word or print, but in action ; a religious respect for truth, honour, habitual purity, and that salutary terror which should impress every upright man on the point of inditing an accusation, or announcing a system. There is no middle course : in the hands of the unconscientious, a free press becomes the opprobrium and the scourge of society ; when used only as the instrument of virtuous talent, it proves its consolatory and tutelary angel.”†

On all important questions, our journalist never swerved from advocating the justice and propriety of the principal reforms ; thus, when alluding to the session in which Thouret presented the project of law of the constitutional committee on judiciary institutions, he abandoned Cazalès :

“M. Thouret,” says he, “renewed all the complaints

* “*Mercure de France*,” January, 1790, No. 5.

† *Ibid.*

so well known, and formerly so forcibly urged by various writers, against the usurpations of the sovereign courts and the intolerable abuses of the administration of justice. These notorious defects, proved by long and fatal experience, could leave no doubt in the mind of any impartial man as to the need of thorough reform ; but M. Thouret could see safety in nothing less than regeneration.

“ The impression of the picture presented by him could not be weakened by the opinion of M. de Cazalès, who, throwing himself into the other extreme, described parliaments as they described themselves in their remonstrances. This was not the most acute logic ; for even truth to be persuasive needs the aid of art, and more especially must guard against exaggeration.”*

* “ *Mercur de France*,” April, 1790, No. 14.

CHAPTER IX.

1790.

Mallet du Pan's journey to Geneva—Return to Paris—Selfishness of the Constituent Assembly—Denunciation of a libel against M. de la Fayette—Article, in the "Mercure," on the year 1789—Duel between Cazalès and Barnave—Opinion on M. Necker—The Editor of the "Mercure" summoned by a deputation of citizens to write in favour of the Revolution—His declaration—He raises his voice in favour of the shamefully ill-treated Catholic clergy—Mirabeau; his death—Particulars extracted from the notes of Mallet du Pan on the connection between Mirabeau and the Court.

IN the spring of 1790, Mallet du Pan took his son to Geneva. His reception in his native country, which he had not seen for eight years, was a sufficient recompense for the solicitude with which, in the midst of the affairs of France, he had, even in his journal, promoted the interests of Geneva, more than once in danger from the members of the National Assembly. It had been loudly hinted in the revolutionary papers, that that republic might probably in its turn undergo the fate of Avignon, and be united to France by a similar procedure. In the tribune, Volney had described the Genevese people as crushed down by oppressive tyranny; Mirabeau, too,

though less violent, had, with his usual inconsiderateness, pronounced sentence on the laws of Geneva; and the eloquence of these two orators had induced the rejection of a gift of nine hundred thousand livres, prudently offered by several individuals of Geneva, varying in their political opinions, and proprietors of funds in the municipality of Paris. The reason alleged for the refusal of the money was, that it was offered by two hundred tyrannical aristocrats.

Things were much worse in the journals. An incendiary libel exhorting the Genevese people to rise, to mount the cockade, and to make the *lanterne* the beacon of liberty, was soon afterwards sent from Paris, and circulated at Geneva. "Such are the means," said Mallet, in denouncing these machinations, "such are the means of regeneration, of persuasion, and of patriotism devised for the establishment of the inalienable rights of man in Geneva. The libel," he adds, "was received by all classes with the most profound contempt." From that moment Mallet considered it as a duty, in the performance of which he never failed, to be on the watch against the manœuvres of the journalists, and to confute the lies they aimed at his country. His fellow-citizens must have been flattered by the display of independence and dignity, in the honour bestowed on the Genevese name by a journalist of such rare merit, even had they not fully appreciated the constancy of his affection.

During this visit to his country, which lasted nearly two months, Mallet wrote not a word in the "*Mercur*." We find nothing of his in its sheets from the 8th of April to the end of May. This is to be regretted; for during the

interval, the Assembly held some memorable sittings, particularly that in which Mirabeau and Barnave discussed the important question as to the part to be taken by the King, in the decision between peace and war.

On his return, he found the arduousness of his duties further aggravated and complicated by party-intrigues; it was necessary to be in the secret of the intentions of the Court in order to gain influence in the Constituent Assembly; and these intentions changed with the counsellors of the moment. Mallet must have been often placed in a painful dilemma, situated as he was between his contempt for petty manœuvres and his sympathy with the position of the King, whose danger he fully appreciated. The strictness of his principles came at such times to his aid, and the credit of his opinion and his journal increased. We shall continue to extract from the "*Mercure*" the passages best adapted to exhibit the character of events—the features, now too much softened down, of a period, which, to our misfortune, we have accustomed ourselves to see only in a poetic and imposing light.

The historian must not forget, what can never be too forcibly remembered, the imprudent injustice of the National Assembly, which, placed between royalty and its enemies, constantly sacrificed the former to the latter; giving them every possible encouragement until the time when, itself death-struck, it loudly demanded its own dissolution, and voted that non-reëligibility which has been ascribed to heroic self-denial; but which was, in reality, nothing more than a necessity reluctantly submitted to. This selfishness of the Assembly, as well as the violence of the clubs and the demagogical papers which laboured in

concert to destroy liberty, was perseveringly exposed by the "Mercure." On the 9th June, the commune of Paris having denounced to the *procureur du roi* an atrocious libel, entitled "Vie de M. Lafayette," the "Mercure" made these significant observations :

"While approving the zeal shown in this case, it is to be regretted that it has not yet extended to the infamous and scandalously calumnious productions directed against the Queen and others, and which are offered to passengers in the Palais-Royal, and under the very walls of the National Assembly. These abominations were continued with impunity for many months ; and, as though the libels did not appease curiosity, care is taken to accompany them with prints worthy of the flames.* It is dreadful to see writings, where the people are exhorted to murder by name, daily sold, hawked about, circulated by the post ; where the butchery of M. de Saint Priest, M. de Bouillé, M. de Gillier, &c., is urged ; where the King and his family are treated with an indignity which obliterates, we will not say the character of Frenchmen, but all trace of civilized society."†

According to his practice, Mallet had announced a history of the year just elapsed ; and he was beginning, indeed, to compose that part of it which related to the foreign policy of Europe. The whole of this opening is an

* "These prints are distinguished by an excess of stupidity and ferocity. Nothing can be more foreign from the French character, or from the humour which gives piquancy to the English caricatures. Those which are displayed on our quays recall the Vandals, and are not even fit to paper a pot-house." (April, 1790, No. 15.)

† "Mercure de France," June, 1790, No. 25.

excellent fragment of history. But, on arriving at France, the writer stopped, asserting that it was too late to retrace the origin and the first steps of the French Revolution.

"This summary," he says, in a memorable passage, "was to have appeared in the month of January last; its production was delayed in the hope that at length the revolution of France would pause, and that one might be able to explain its causes, events and character, without compromising the claims of reason, justice and truth. But the constitution is not completed; it is being decided amid ever-increasing excitement, which does not allow of our distinguishing the disturbances which may be caused by new institutions from such as belong to a transitory licentiousness. But we still hover between anarchy and freedom. The nation is independent; but the empire of the law still totters under the influence of partial desires, terror and force.

"The declaration of rights and the impunity of the most scandalous writings, seemed to have secured to every citizen the privilege of printing his opinions freely, of examining the nascent laws while rigidly conforming to them in his conduct, and of taking part in that public censorship important at all times to the maintenance of liberty, and so necessary in the dawn of a legislation whose extent the human mind can scarcely calculate. But in this respect, as in so many others, we remain under a rule absolutely arbitrary. No law has determined the liberty of the press, nor the responsibility of authors, nor established the special tribunals to which the prosecution of their excesses is to be confined; nor the nature of the offence, nor that of the penalty. According to the kind of men, of

circumstances, of opinions, everything is settled—or nothing. One preaches periodically murder and robbery, whose success he prepares by calumny—he receives a civic crown: the other states a doubt, a proven fact, a principle in opposition to those which he thinks opposed to the public advantage, and men cry him down as a rebel. The sphere of offences of the press enlarged from the moment when its independence was proclaimed; the abuse of reasoning, and in some cases reason itself, has been transformed into ‘treason against the nation;’ so that the scaffold might be made the penalty of an offence which tyrants have seldom dared to visit with capital punishment. And who denounces, who prosecutes, who judges? Whoever chooses to usurp the function! individuals, municipalities, districts, committees, clubs, political associations. How escape this circle of spies, informers, self-constituted delegates, who persecute the human mind and public reason?

“ Even if this unconstitutional police produce not discouragement, what is the consequence of a firm resolution to obey conscience and defend liberty? Fruitless suffering, persecutions incalculably severe, and, in short, an abortive struggle of the press in which reason and sound criticism are silenced by terror and prudence.

“ It must not be expected that, under circumstances so distressing, I should put forth such a narrative as I had conceived and arranged; I must confine myself to the discharge of an onerous debt, instead of satisfying my own desires and those of my readers. Let them look around, on their city, on their homes, on the entire surface of the empire, and they will forgive my substituting a few faint touches for a finished picture of the events of a year.

in which the memorable spectacle of a great nation nobly aspiring after liberty with consentaneous will, on the call of their King, was thrown into the shade by innumerable crimes, misfortunes and sorrows.”*

Mallet’s most implacable persecutor was Brissot, an enemy whose attacks he usually passed over in silence, though occasionally he burst forth :

“Not one word of reply shall I condescend to make to the atrocious insults heaped upon me by Brissot in that daily paper of his which sweats blood. I leave him to his remorse if he is susceptible of it ; but who will believe that in the midst of his invectives he dares to threaten me with the Committee of Research ?† Ah ! what watch-

* “*Mercure de France*,” July, 1790, No. 28.

† Brissot, in his “*Patriote Français*,” of the 6th of August, had said : “They have already given an account of this affair (of d’Hosier and Petit-Jean) in a journal which forms the delight of the agonising aristocracy, and whose author has no partiality for the Committee of Research, doubtless for the selfsame reason that thieves and their abettors object to the light. I have only reckoned up in this somewhat faithless article of the ‘*Mercure*,’ eighteen lies in twenty-four lines. ‘*Ab uno disce omnes*.’ This is the man who dispenses certificates of probity and patriotism to MM. Mounier and Lally-Tollendal ; the man who acts the Don Quixote in all conspiracies The man, moreover, who had the rascality to stain what is most holy, to ridicule the fraternal banquet of the 13th of July, celebrated in London by the friends of the Revolution : that banquet-pledge of the future union of the two nations ; the man who cast scorn on Dr. Price, a philanthropist grown old in the exercise of virtue, in combats for liberty.” The next day Brissot returned to the charge. “. . . I have fully weighed the term rascality, and am ready to justify its application in any court. I have a greater hatred of calumny than any one : above all, I hate to hate, but &c., &c.”—“*Patriote Français*,” of the 7th of August.

fulness is necessary in official situations, when we see that men elevated to them, most violent declaimers beforehand against the abuse of authority, become capable of enforcing the most dreadful excesses ! Well, my last word to this menacing inquisitor is, that I have ever been and shall ever be prepared to have my actions, my writings, my words and my thoughts arraigned in any court of justice ; nor do I even decline that identical one which he compromises by his accusations, and which, I doubt not, is far from approving the extravagances of this calumnious news-monger”*

It is known that a duel took place between Barnarve and Cazalès ; the latter was dangerously wounded : that wound saved his life.

“ M. de Cazalès is out of danger,” says the “*Mercur* ;” “ he had been wounded in the head by the second thrust of his adversary ; fortunately his hat, and his attitude prevented the blow from being mortal. During his illness he received numerous and most touching proofs of esteem and affection, and was also the object of the most fierce attacks. We have heard it regretted that his accident was not fatal ; and some even dared to repeat approvingly a speech uttered amidst crowds in public places, that, if M. Cazalès had killed M. Barnarve, he would have been massacred himself. A false report of his death was received by these cannibals with undisguised joy. After twenty years experience we are ready to repeat, what we have ever maintained, that no noble sentiment, no moral principle, no natural affection, can withstand the withering and venomous effects of political fanaticism ; a passion

* “*Mercur de France*,” August, 1790, No. 33.

which converts the grosser and less humane portion of mankind into tigers, while it perverts generous nations by inuring them to ferocious desires least compatible with their character. Such at the present day is the spirit of justice inculcated in the lower classes: whoever differs in opinion from their flatterers is declared worthy of death; and whoever remarks it will be, like ourselves, denounced in sanguinary libels, where the people every day may read new sentences of proscription, such as, a *vile slave*, a *partizan of tyranny*, an *outrageous aristocrat*. Liberty in France at this moment, revolves within this circle.”*

It was well said by Mirabeau, on an occasion when it was proposed to send an address to the army, exhorting them to remember the obligations imposed on them by their oath: “It is time to make a *declaration of duties*.” The “*Mercur*” noted that this remarkable avowal deserves to be borne in mind:

“Then it is confessed that the declaration of the rights of man was liable to abuse, as had been foretold by so many men of penetration at Versailles. Then it is true that a declaration of duties is necessary, though indignantly rejected at Versailles, in despite of the prophetic eloquence of M. Redon! What crimes and disasters might not have been spared to the nation by M. Mirabeau, if he had made the above avowal a year ago.”†

Mirabeau having insisted more strongly than any other man on the danger of too frequent and too comprehensive popular elections, the “*Mercur*” again remarks, while congratulating the author on this change of opinion:

* “*Mercur de France*,” August, 1790.

† *Ibid.*, August, 1790, No. 35.

“The elections are no longer composed of sages, incorruptible patriots, and unprejudiced philosophers: M. de Mirabeau informs us, for the first time, that popular assemblies are the stronghold of faction, cabal, intrigue, and corruption.”*

At the beginning of September, 1790, in consequence of the popular cry which, at the very doors of the Assembly, demanded the dismissal of ministers who had betrayed their country, Necker secretly quitted a ministry which he had rejoined amid the acclamations of Paris and of France. The reflections which this catastrophe of so much political glory suggested to Mallet, are worthy of insertion at full length:

“The causes of M. Necker’s precipitate departure, the indifference with which the public viewed it, his arrest on the road, the letter from the President of the Assembly to the ex-minister, are facts full of meaning that deserve to be recorded in the history of our day. They will be a lesson to public men; and would be to the nations also, if these ever listened to any except from their flatterers.

“Not fifteen months ago, M. Necker was the object of fanatical idolatry: his name headed the revolution: a sedition at Versailles punished the King for having withdrawn from him his confidence: the chiefs of the communes, adroitly identifying their interest with his, overwhelmed him with condolences on his misfortune, with congratulations on his return. The day of his departure in the following month, was a day of mourning and very nearly of blood. His bust, carried in triumph through the capital as the palladium of liberty, set all heads on fire; the

* “*Mercur de France*,” September, 1790, No. 38.

theatres were closed, and, in this public calamity, the Assembly and the people vied with each other in advising the King to recal his minister.

“He returned : he showed himself at that Hôtel-de-Ville, where the monarch had preceeded him some days before. Louis XVI. had been told that his people had made conquest of him ; M. Necker appeared as the conqueror both of people and court. Frenzied acclamations marked his triumphal entry ; he was intoxicated with adulatory harangues ; the pompous compliments of the National Assembly followed those of the capital ; the momentary exaltation was delightful—but the downfall followed next day. If M. Necker had hoped to save France by ruling its legislators, he was promptly undeceived. On the first trial of his power, he met with rebuffs ; his name and his opposition to the court were no longer needed ; his courtiers became his masters. In vain did he timidly address them ; his advances were not responded to ; his ascendancy declined from day to day ; the deference paid him in matters of finance could not compensate for the discredit attached to his opinions. He lavished them in vain, and, by a remarkable fatality, his political councils were unsuccessful, except in the memorable discussion on the absolute *вето*, against which he declared, yet not till he had been convinced by M. Mounier. They worked on his weakness and fears to bring him to a decision.

“The same feeling of dread soon carried him into the vortex of the torrent ; he swam with the waves, instead of stemming them ; he saw the monarchy strike on the rocks, without having the power to work at the helm. He withdrew his confidence from the last defenders of

royal authority, in the vain hope of subduing its enemies, who took advantage of his illusion. They flattered rather than enlightened him ; ineffectually did he struggle against the despotic rule which was rising on the ruins of the Government ; he was not even allowed a share in it : his remonstrances, his communications, listened to at first with transport, and acceded to with acclamations, now inspired impatience, and at last murmurs. In vain did he address the Assembly in a tone of submission and flattery, entitling it a galaxy of light, a senate of sages ; he met with no response from policy, ambition, or hatred. Complaints at last were made of the continual interference of the Minister of Finance, in the administration of his own department ; his office was changed to that of Public Treasurer, at the very moment when he was reproached for not devising general measures. Attacks of a more private nature weighed on his sensitive mind ; and the very man whose return had been hailed by illuminations all over France, and whose head was bowed down a year ago under the weight of civic crowns, was reduced to carry on a contest of pamphlets with M. Camus and a herd of contemptible journalists.

“ It cannot be disputed that M. Necker ought not to have been content to remain so long the spectator of his own degradation. The commotion of Thursday the 2nd, made him resolve to retire. It is certain, that at eight o'clock in the evening, M. de la Fayette despatched an aide-de-camp to warn him of impending danger, and exhort him to quit his house. Accompanied by the aide-de-camp, he went to his country seat at St. Ouen, whence he sent in his resignation to the National Assembly

Some curiosity having been excited in the village by his nocturnal and unlooked-for arrival, he judged it prudent to absent himself; and after wandering till break of day in the valley of Montmorency, he returned to Paris in the morning. Nothing was wanting as the climax of his singular destiny, but the insult offered him at Arcis-sur-Aube. We shall pass over the general report, that he was indebted for this affront to the ardent zeal of a person well known: so infamous a manœuvre cannot be credited without positive proof.

“What party spirit, hatred and libels can never deprive him of, is the merit due to pure integrity, in the midst of corruption, disinterestedness in an age of venality, indefatigable zeal in the labours of his office, constant attention to the miseries of the people, and a spirit of order and moderation in the administration of the finances, without which the risk is increased of ruining a declining state, or of overthrowing it by violent measures.

“Sagacious men, who are still members of the National Assembly, advised M. Necker, immediately after his return, to present a general account of the expenditure, and of the requisite funds, to secure the consent of the house to his views, or to resign. He set off in another track, and preferred risking innovations and embarrassments, which could but lead to the defeat of his object.

“It is worthy of note, that this Minister, whose writings were a perpetual homage to opinion, should have been the chosen victim of its vicissitudes. The reason was, that M. Necker always confounded the opinion of Paris, of prejudice, and of the moment, with that which

time and wisdom profess and consecrate. He thought himself irremovably fixed on his sandy pyramid; he strikingly justified those who express contempt for the renown of a day. People erred in adoring him in 1789; they also erred in maligning him in 1790.

“ It is easy to conceive that citizens, ruined, burned out, persecuted, proscribed for fifteen months past; that the advocates of deliberations, by the orders, severally, or of the declaration of the 23rd of June; that even the opponents of both these systems, who intrenched liberty behind the negative power of the Crown, should have withdrawn their esteem and confidence from M. Necker; but that the disciples of the principles which he carried out triumphantly, and of the truths which have been rendered odious by unjust and cruel perversion—that those on whom M. Necker lavished deference, to whom he sacrificed everything, his own views not excepted; whose projects he furthered by condescension, whose exaggerations he flattered, whose interests he scrupulously consulted, should have consigned him to public detestation; that the people whom his personal credit and his care saved from starvation; that the people, prostrate before him, when he opposed the Crown, should, when the Crown had no more to relinquish, have demanded his head—this is a phenomenon which must inspire a horror of public favour, and afford consolation for the loss of popularity.

“ May M. Necker forget the weakness which rendered him too anxious concerning these; the downfall of his glory, the French monarchy destroyed under his administration, and the ill-considered promise he rashly made in

December, 1789, in an address worthy of eternal record, when he assured a virtuous prince who confided to him the interests of the throne, that under the shelter of his policy, the people would be more obedient, and the monarch more happy.”*

Advantage was taken of these observations on M. Necker, to attack another point of their author’s character. The accusation and the defence are recorded in the following passage inserted in the “*Mercur* :”

“ I believe myself to have maintained in this article the moderation suitable to a man whose conscience and whose pen will never be influenced by considerations of hatred or of favour. I still believe it ; and assuredly abuse only adds to the steadfastness of my opinion. While I expressed it cautiously amidst the clash of furious passions and mortifying indifference in regard to M. Necker ; in his own country, imbecile disciples of Brissot, Marat, and Desmoulins, were propagating a report that I was paid by the *aristocrats* to vilify M. Necker ; that I was taking my revenge for not having been consulted by that minister ; that I was insincere on the subject of the veto, with a score of similar turpitudes. I shall not condescend to answer so much baseness, and indeed only mention this to comfort those who might imagine that only in Paris do we find this vile species of calumniators, at once too stupid to discuss opinions, and sufficiently base to ascribe them, in those who have the frankness to avow any, to disgraceful motives.”†

In other respects, Mallet gave proof of his impartiality

* “*Mercur de France*,” September, 1790, No. 38.

† *Ibid.*, October, 1790, No. 44

by defending M. Necker and the other ministers from the contradictory allegations brought against them in the Assembly (sittings of the 18th, 19th, and 20th October), at once by the left and the right. Cazalès accused them of having betrayed the royal authority, and occasioned all the misfortunes of the monarchy; while on the opposite side of the Assembly they were reproached with not having ruled in accordance with the spirit of the Revolution. The speech of Cazalès, expressed with eloquent brilliancy, but little generosity, the long-cherished resentment of his party against the policy of the Necker administration. Mallet du Pan judged that the more M. de Cazalès' loyalty, the beauties of his speech, the vividness of his ideas, and the justice of many of his motives merited esteem, the more essential it became to weigh his words impartially:

“ On reading the withering epithets and contemptuous expressions employed by this orator, we can scarcely recognise that moderation which presides even over the National Assembly, when personal comments are made: a moderation which M. de Cazalès habitually exemplifies. On other lips one would imagine this bitter and caustic language to emanate from the head of a party, or from a personal enemy; and undoubtedly the orator has here yielded to a zeal whose motives I honour, but whose expressions I consider exaggerated and impolitic.

“ There is no greater injustice, to my thinking, than the charge levelled at M. Necker of having preferred his own ambition and security, to the duty of guiding the Assembly to the administration of Finance. It is impossible to guide one who will not be guided;— to guide one who at the first step tutors his teacher; to guide the governor who razes

all his fortifications, burns his magazines, and opens his gates ; to turn afterwards upon the engineer with the accusation of having ill defended the fortress. It is impossible to re-organize the finances in the midst of universal anarchy, annihilation of rule, impunity of disorder, and the fanaticism which, to gratify the people, dries up the sources of public revenue : to re-organize finances without credit, without taxes, without public power, without confidence. At the opening of the States General, M. Necker stated the deficit and the means to supply it. Was it he who conceived new systems, increased the burden, and propped it by a paper currency ? Do not let us give the lie to facts, but leave the blame to those who incurred it. To accuse M. Necker of the ruin of our finance, is to accuse him of the loss of the battle of Ramillies.”*

Here occurs an episode characteristic of the journalist's life at this period. It is easy to believe that after the threatening visits, of which an account has already been given, revolutionary fury gave no quarter to the author of the “*Mercury*.” The clubs, Brissot's gazette, and others, heaped upon him calumnies and accusations :

“ I only opposed,” Mallet could declare with all sincerity, “ I only opposed to this harassing warfare my present and past life. I laid it open to the scrutiny of malice and rage. I continued with the firmness which befits an honest man, to express principles which were not implanted in me by the revolution, and which have taught me to recognize the grave of liberty, of public order, and of the State, in exaggerated enthusiasm and blundering inexperience.

“ It is easy to believe that this course of conduct, to

* “*Mercury de France*, 7 October, 1790, No. 38.

which I owe the esteem of all to whom honour, self-respect, and love of freedom, are not unknown, disarmed not one of the passions whose workings my calling condemns me to record week by week."

During the latter months of 1790, he was the object of fresh hostilities, of which he himself gives an account illustrative of the blindness of the times :

"On Monday the 15th, I was informed that, in certain public places, I had become an object of those motions by which individuals, arrogating to themselves the verdict of the nation, dispose of the lives of citizens. Several journals on the next day, held me up to the mob, as a preacher of counter-revolution, an aristocrat who stirred up the people against the taxes, an underling of despotism wanting in respect to certain deputies. To complete these writings, dictated by want, jealousy and fanaticism, and suited to carry us back to the morrow of St. Bartholomew, it was only wanting that they should be written in my blood. Their success was soon evident: towards noon I was warned that a mob collected in the neighbourhood, were threatening to treat my house like that of M. de Castries. Happily, *sanctiores erant aures populi quam corda sacerdotum*, and the craving teachers of the multitude failed to work them up to the required pitch.

"Next day the disturbance continued, and on Thursday morning a deputation desiring to speak with me was announced. Fourteen or fifteen strangers, of whom half remained in the court-yard, composed this embassy. One of them, addressing me, informed me that they were deputed by the patriotic societies of the Palais-Royal, to give me notice to change my principles, and to discontinu-

my attacks on the constitution ; otherwise the most violent extremities would be resorted to against me. He added that they had prevented the Palais-Royal from descending upon my abode, and that their notice was meant in kindness. ‘I recognize,’ I replied to this deputy and his colleagues, ‘no authority except that of the law and the tribunals. Let me be arraigned before them ; I am prepared to answer for my actions and my writings. It is strange that in a country where freedom of the press has been proclaimed, and where it is atrociously abused, any man should outrage it by such proceedings.’ ‘But, Sir,’ was the reply, ‘you attack the decrees, the National Assembly, the patriots, the champions of liberty.’ ‘The law alone,’ I answered, ‘is your judge and mine. It is an offence against the constitution to interfere with the liberty of thought and writing.’ ‘The public will is the constitution,’ rejoined the first speaker ; ‘the will of the strongest party is the law. You are under the rule of the strongest party, and must submit to it. We make known to you the choice of the people—and that is law.’

“In fact, I cannot doubt the terrible truth that we were living under the law of might ; but I vainly endeavoured to make them feel that liberty and compulsion are incompatible. Five or six were speaking at once, and contradicting each other. One of them, having reproached me with filling the “*Mercure*” with false facts, I invited him to prove his position by bringing forward these facts : he quoted M. de Castries’ affair ; and I had some difficulty in convincing him that as the last “*Mercure*” was issued before this event, it was impossible I should have mentioned it at all. One of the deputies agreed in this obser-

vation ; which proves how greatly they had been imposed upon. Others, reverting to general grievances, accused me of favouring the ancient system, and of speaking incessantly of the executive power. ‘The ancient system,’ I answered, ‘neither has had nor ever will have a more inveterate enemy than myself, who have suffered more than any other from its oppression. Bring forward one line of the “*Mercur*” expressive of a desire for its renewal. As to the royal authority—yes, certainly, I will defend it even until violence stops my mouth, as the firmest rampart of your freedom, and as the pledge of the preservation of the monarchy.’ ‘Oh!’ they replied with one accord, ‘we should be very sorry to be without a King: we love the King, and will defend his authority; but you are forbidden to act against the prevalent opinion, and against the liberty decreed by the National Assembly.”

“ ‘— Gentlemen,’ I resumed, ‘I did not come to France to learn liberty of you. I was born in its native element; for twenty years I lived amid its storms; it is not within the last twenty-four hours that I have studied its laws. Is there a single scrap of evidence, to indicate the true road? Wait for experience, and till then respect liberty of opinion. I do not give out mine as infallible; but no one on this point has more right than myself. Is it in the midst of anarchy that you expect to judge of the results of theories which run counter to the authority of all ages and of all philosophers? Some day, perhaps, you will thank me for having tried to save you from the errors into which others are dragging you, and for having defended those principles which I consider alone consonant with the interests and the liberty of the nation.”

“ Again they answered me, that I must not oppose the will of the people, disobey the decrees and provoke the nation. ‘ At any rate,’ added one of the party, ‘ we have executed our office ; and your only plan, unless you are willing to brave the justice of the people, is to alter your opinion.’ ‘ It is in your power,’ I replied, ‘ to use violence against me which I have no means to oppose ; to burn my house, and to drag me to the scaffold ; but never will you compel me to be an apostate. I cannot resist main force ; if this takes the pen from my hand, I shall relinquish it without regret.’

“ I heard one voice deplore my infatuation : another speaker urged me, in a friendly manner, to subscribe to the dominant opinions, and to write in favour of them : he even did me the honour to say that they would come and thank me. ‘ On the contrary,’ I answered while thanking him, ‘ I should so earn your contempt, and you cannot deem so ill of me as to believe me capable of such baseness. Moreover, I repeat that, being as I am destitute of all personal interest in these political debates, and having propagated my opinions only in the manner authorized by the law and the good of all, if main force deprives me of that liberty which the law gave but cannot secure to me, I shall depart to seek some refuge where it is safe from violence.’

“ Thus terminated our quarter of an hour’s interview : I relate it from my own recollections, and those of some persons present. It would be unjust to omit stating that this odious mission could not have been executed more considerately ; that not one of the deputies failed in civility towards me ; that several among them even showed signs of interest in my behalf ; that the only one who gave his

name, M. Fournier, took pains to reassure my wife and children, who witnessed this scene ; and if I have anything to complain of, it is that these very well-dressed deputies did not substitute for vague talk with a hundred interruptions, a conversation more to the point ; for then, with the 'Mercure' in my hand, I should have shown them the monstrous character of the calumnies by which their judgment had been misled.

"On the same day, M. Panckoucke, proprietor of the journals which I edit, received the same summons, delivered with the same forms ; although repeatedly and in public, he justly disclaimed all personal responsibility regarding the opinions expressed by the editors."*

Such facts sufficiently demonstrate the annihilation of public order, and the inability of the civil laws to ensure the safety of individuals.

"How must we reply," observes Mallet, "to those who, following this example, are warranted in saying : What do I care for the rights of man which you have inscribed on parchment, if the right of force lords it over them with impunity ? What care I for rights which are respected by those who are alike powerless to violate, or to defend them ?

"The free communication of thought and opinion ranks among the most important rights of man. Every citizen, therefore, may speak, write, publish freely, being responsible in the cases determined by law for his use of this liberty. Either this decree is an egregious deception, or no man can lawfully deprive me of the exercise of this liberty. If every individual society, laying claim to the

* "Mercure de France," November, 1790, No. 48.

power of the people and of public authority, is free to overrule the law, to set up the will of the nation against the sacred privileges of citizens, to anathematize them and execute its own sentence, society is at an end, innocence has lost its refuge, and the constitution becomes nothing more than the absence of all government. Here I appeal to the candour of even those who do not hesitate to intrench on that liberty in others which they demand for themselves. What, then, was that ancient system whose tyranny they have prostrated, unless it was the right of the stronger? What are we the better if *lettres de cachet*, instead of issuing from the minister's office, are in the power of the clubs, scribblers, and the Palais-Royal?"*

The man whom the scribblers pointed out to popular fury as a foe to the Revolution, had a full right to turn on those who, professing to be its friends, were too oblivious of their past conduct. This Mallet did in the following dignified defence:

"I will reply," he says in the same article, "I will reply once for all to the calumnies which obtained for me the domiciliary visit of last week.

"I will reply to them in a word, by offering my life and my works to the strictest scrutiny.

"I am accused of being *an enemy to the Revolution*, a mysterious and sacramental name, which, like that of Huguenot in the sixteenth century, now serves as a signal to assassins. If by *Revolution*, that memorable change worthy the admiration of ages is understood, in consequence of which an absolute monarchy, cankered with abuses, already dissolved before its downfall, was to give

* "Mercure de France," November, 1790, No. 48.

place to a legal and orderly government, of which the King, in his paternal abnegation, had himself laid the foundations, no one has conceived or expressed more impassioned and disinterested desires for the success of so noble an enterprize.

“ But, if the so-called love for the Revolution, is no more than an outcry of enmity and violence ; if it consists in drawing down, every three months, some catastrophe, and then applauding it ; in setting no limits to an anarchy favourable only to the factious, and allowing no choice in the means of acquiring liberty ; if it consists in ignoring all principles, and gradually undermining the constitution ; in interfering with public order, safety, and individual freedom, under the pretext of civic zeal ; in giving rise to a fearful warfare between weak and strong ; in persecuting on mere suspicion ; in renewing insurrections for a doubt ; and in erecting the sovereignty of the people into an unbounded despotism, multiplied by as many times as there are sections in the empire ; - if this, I say, is what we are to acknowledge as the most admirable system of human government,—*let us have things as they were.*

“ Shall I add, that one of my crimes is attacking those whom reporters and newsmongers denominate the champions of freedom ? Certainly, it is not on the word of a few journalists that history and posterity will award titles. It is not in the heat of battle, nor in the darkness of tempest, that one can distinguish crests. Certain friends of the people are, in my eyes, the executioners of their rights : no law can force me to submit my opinion on this matter to any other person. Time will decide between opposite views ; and till then I will not bestow

the prostituted name of champion of freedom on any one who fails to respect and defend the liberty of all.

“As to my political principles, they are my concern, and mine only: anterior to the Revolution, the Revolution has given them an additional hold upon my mind. I have avowed them often enough, and with sufficient energy, to remove suspicion from every honest reader; but as a renewed profession of them is required, I declare, that, as a zealous admirer of the principles of the British Constitution, I persist in regarding those as the only ones adapted to any extensive State in which the monarchy is to be preserved; the only ones which combine the rights of freedom with those of authority, and popular influence with legal subordination; and which, by a well-ordered balance of powers, restrain all from excess, by opposing the interest of each to mutual usurpation, and the interest of all to attempts that violate the constitution.

“Without this proportion, countenanced by experience; without the division of the legislation, and the rigorously concentrated unity of executive power, I cannot imagine a representative government as anything but a stage for unruly factions, of which the end is to bring back speedily either the most stormy democracy, if the people take into their own hands the direct exercise of their authority, or an oppressive aristocracy, if it succeeds in seducing or lulling them to sleep.

“Thus, since I have attained the faculty of reason, a twenty years’ abode in the midst of popular troubles having also ripened my judgment, mixed governments have appeared to me the only ones suited to human

nature ; the only ones which allow of just and enduring laws ; the only ones, more especially, capable of combination with the moral degeneracy at which the people of modern times have arrived.

“ Must I repeat it ? Such was the invincible opinion of a man whose maxims others dare to distort and borrow — of J. J. Rousseau, who, by the definition he gave of the essential conditions of democracy, has banished it for ever from the midst of us.

“ Even were my doctrine erroneous, I should not dream of disclaiming it at a moment when no one tolerates discussion, and when all my arguments have only been answered by insolent calumnies ; but certainly this fanatical proscription, which aims at subjugating reason to ideas of a twelvemonth’s growth, whereas reason limits itself to defending the fruit of centuries and experience, is a marvellous fact to record in the history of the human mind. That is a very confident vanity which imperatively rejects the authority of time, the deductions of ages, and the example of nations, by an order to conform to novelties formed on no model, and whose result is hidden in the future.

“ Let men, careless of the reputation of others, because they are so of their own, adopt and repeat the most atrocious accusations ; let such men even repeat, after these malicious scribblers, whom, for the last time, I lower myself so far as to quote, that my opinions are *bought* ; let them assert that the ministers and the so-called aristocrats have ensured my voice with *hard cash* ; I will reply to them, with the son of Mithridates,

“ . . . Ils ne vous croiront pas ; ”*

And this is why they won't believe you. I lived six years under the old Government ; and if I did not lose my establishment, if I was not buried in Bastilles, I owe it to the bearing I maintained before the authorities, and to my offers of resignation a hundred times repeated. One of the ministers is still in office : his testimony will not be open to suspicion. The censors who environed me, and who had been tripled for my especial behoof, can speak to the amount of favour I enjoyed. Determined to lose all rather than sacrifice my independence, I had frequently declared, to various ministers, that they might suppress everything I wrote, but that they would never force from me a word of praise, nor one line, against my own conscience.

“ Thus, whilst in verse and prose, so many impassioned writers grew sublime, for a consideration, over the acts of the members of the Government ; whilst they celebrated the vilest courtiers, I was looked upon as a notable detractor of royalty—an unmanageable republican. Favours were showered on these generous men of letters. Well ! now-a-days all these obscure valets of the opinion and power of the moment are heroes of liberty, the friends of the people, the anti-ministerial declaimers. As for me, I am the slave and pensioner of the Court.

“ Assuredly, my name has not been found down upon either the ‘ red-books,’ or the registers of bounties and pensions. I have not shared even in those granted as

* Mallet is in error here. It is in the mouth of Burrhus, when repelling the accusations and threats of Agrippina, that Racine placed this noble answer.

acquittances on the enormous dues paid by political papers. I congratulate myself that it is so; not through a ridiculous disinterestedness, but because, having a right to such favours, I cannot reproach myself with a single letter, a single step, a single visit, a single solicitation, which could tend to call it to mind. I asked for nothing, received nothing: and would to God the Revolution had only enlisted men equally free from obligation! It would not have made so many ingrates.

“I have often, doubtless, adopted the defence of ministers, and still oftener that of the constitutional authority, which they were commissioned to uphold. I take pride in having raised my voice against the atrocity of the combined defamation and accusations levelled against the Chancellor and Messieurs de St. Priest and de la Tour du Pin. In doing so, I rendered homage to truth, far more precious than the ministers. The riches I acquired in this contest, consisted in the share I drew down on myself of the disfavour to which they were exposed. There is nothing but cowardice in attacking public men without power, unable to do good or harm, and whose support is not worth that of a street demagogue: the courage lies in daring to defend them.

“I shall be pardoned for the length of this personal digression; I conclude it by applying to my opinions these lines of Voltaire:

“ . . . Renoncer aux dieux que l'on croit dans son cœur.
C'est le crime d'un lâche, et non pas une erreur;
C'est quitter à la fois, sous un masque hypocrite,
Et le dieu que l'on sert et le dieu que l'on quitte,
C'est mentir au ciel même, à l'univers, à soi.”

Shortly after this occasion, Mallet had an opportunity of proving that he was perfectly insensible to intimidation.

Many persons, perhaps, did not expect that a Protestant and a Genevese would raise an eloquent voice in behalf of the Catholic clergy; yet no one at this time branded with more energy the odious ill-treatment lavished on ecclesiastics:

“No sitting of the National Assembly has been reported by the journalists with more unfaithfulness, suppression of truth and collusion, than that of the 4th, when the clergy was called upon to take the new civic oath. These scribblers have similarly deceived the public as to the number of ecclesiastics who subscribed to that obligation.

“We speak not a word save on authenticated information. In that horrible tumult, many persons were knocked down and injured. Atrocious placards had been posted up in several churches, among others at St. Paul’s, where, as also at St. Roche and St. Germain l’Auxerrois, the same scandal was repeated.

“Posterity will easily understand the expropriation of the clergy, the reduction of its revenues, the abolition of its privileges, the changes effected in its discipline. Opinions will be divided, fifty years hence as at the present day, on the necessity of this reform; but what will be contemplated only with a shudder of indignation is the pitiless inveteracy which persecutes the members of this unfortunate order; they excite the compassion even of the impious. Strangers learn with horror the threats with which they have been overwhelmed these twenty months. Is it conceivable that our effeminate character should be so cruel? — that, at the moment when

jugglers smear their boards with the words of virtue, tolerance, humanity, liberty; men are not satisfied with the ruin of the clergy, its abasements, the deprivation of its honours, its credit; but heap on it, day by day, ignominy and outrage, while profiting by its spoils; that wretches dare constantly to speak of assassinating, at the first murmur of complaint, those whose property the nation has just confiscated?

“Those who excite daily the public fury against ecclesiastics, are the very writers who, when under the yoke, most loudly cried for tolerance. According to them, the clergy is not only to submit to any sacrifice—they forbid it even to murmur. If the smallest perquisite of their own is disputed, their fortune menaced by decree the least in the world, they rave of tyranny, and the rights of property. Among these vultures, who, not content with devouring their prey, delight in tearing it with their talons, are recognized with horror the old vampires of the nation, usurers, and the whole train of stock-jobbers.

“Hear the echoes to which the scribblers daily minister in their imprecations against the priests. They defend the cause of *primitive Christianity*; *they would restore religion to its purity*; *they burn to secure religious liberty to the human race*. Joining thus hypocrisy to inhumanity, they despotically impose laws on the conscience of the ecclesiastics, and give them their choice either of murderous outrage, or of stifling their scruples. And it is at an epoch when religious principles have given place to the blindest scepticism, when some maniac who has taken his creed from the ‘*Système de la Nature*,’ menaces with the *lanterne* the bishop—he will not sacrifice his own opinions to heretics!

it is attempted, on penalty of defamation and perils, to compel an oath which the legislature has left optional. One phenomenon was wanting to our age—that of atheism, a persecutor. We shall owe the honour of it to the teachers who charge themselves at present with the education of the universe.”*

Mirabeau, as may have been noticed, inspired a mistrust in Mallet, which rendered him but little susceptible to the sometimes forced energy and warmth of his eloquence. He was far, however, from denying the oratorical powers and the genius of this great actor in the Revolution.

On the death of Mirabeau, we find the following passage in the “*Mercur* :”

“Desiring neither to interrupt the storm of homage, nor to minister to the cravings of hatred or injustice, I resign these first moments to the rhetoricians. It is well to leave free course to passion, apotheoses, funeral orations and diatribes. Respect for truth should always be subordinated to the duties of decorum. When feelings are more calm, and when I shall have thought over my own, I will state the opinion which M. de Mirabeau leaves me of himself, without wishing to gain over that of any one else.†

* “*Mercur de France*,” January 12, 1791, No. 1.

† The moment for doing this did not come at once. It was but a few months prior to his death, in 1800, in the “*Mercur Britanique*,” that Mallet took occasion to characterize the share of Mirabeau in the Revolution. This judgment is dispassionate, indeed, and remarkably moderate. In particular, he vindicates Mirabeau, against the opinion of M. de Molleville, from all participation in the attacks on Versailles (5th and 6th of October).

“The presumptions then formed against him were founded on the detestable reputation of the accused, and his not less colourless expres-

“ The man whose memory excites thus, and in opposite senses, the conflict of opinions, can have been no common man. M. de Mirabeau carries with him the regrets, not only of his adherents, but also of a section of the minority, which built hopes and projects on the secret views of this party leader.”

These last lines are to be remarked. Mallet knew somewhat of the negociations of the Court with Mirabeau, but he expected little result from them, and did not, like his friend Malouet, believe that Mirabeau had arrived at the moment, when, without compromising his popularity, he could render it useful to the common weal.*

In fact, is not the power attributed to Mirabeau of repossessing himself of the Revolution, because he had let

sions in the Assembly, on that same 5th of October, even more than on the depositions, so inconclusive, discordant and conjectural, contained in the worthless farrago collected by Le Châtelet.

“ Now that time has quieted the first heat excited by this proceeding, it must be allowed that no judge would venture to issue a warrant for the arrest of an accused person on evidence so frivolous.

“ We have long sought to fathom the mystery of this fearful event. We have compared accounts of all kinds, and collected authorities in sufficiency. These investigations have convinced us, that Mirabeau participated neither in the conception nor in the execution of this crime, whose uncongenial incentives have never been known otherwise than imperfectly.

“ But, like several others of the factions in the Assembly, to whom every great disturbance was a delight, a benefit and a means, Mirabeau was glad to see the King, the royal family and the government, enveloped in a storm which placed them at the mercy of the demagogues of the moment.”—*Mercurc Britannique*, No. 33.

See, in the “*Mercurc*” of April, 1791, No. 15, a remarkable opinion of Mirabeau, by Malouet.

it loose—of recommencing the work because he had been the chief workman, an opinion so generally entertained at the present day—one of those hypotheses in which history delights to take shelter from the contradiction she is too often compelled to give to the conjectures of reason?

All Mirabeau's deficiency in claims to respect, in reliable character—all that compromising past which clung to him—were nothing, opposed to his wonderful power of working on the feelings, as long as that power acted in accordance with the revolutionary passions and interests so tumultuously excited. The movement which carried public attention far away from the past, scarcely allowed it time to contemplate the present. But, should the movement slacken, or stop, the *prestige* ceases, reality reappears, and the hero, as though deprived of his enchantment, will vanish, an object of indifference to the multitude. Aladdin has lost his lamp. Mirabeau, like a superior mind and a good citizen, decided for royalty in distress against the unpopularity which threatened him, and which indeed reached him at times. How could he have long continued to resist, when he scarcely maintained his ground without gaining a step on his enemies, that is, on all the enemies of royalty? And God knows whether they were formidable. Brissot declares, that had Mirabeau lived, he would have stifled the Revolution. The assertion is natural enough from the demagogue who had to justify his hatred; and this opinion proves moreover, how much it was the interest of the revolutionists to destroy him, and with what zeal they would have done so. What man, even were he greater than Mirabeau, could have made head against this virulence, this determined and unscrupulous hostility? Mirabeau died opportunely for the per-

manence of his name and the poetic gratification of future generations. A few days more would have only served to give him time to descend into the ranks, obscure indeed, of the martyrs of reason and moderation, and to die vanquished. Perhaps at this day, we should not talk more of him than of the virtuous Bailly: the great Mirabeau would be to us merely a brilliant orator of the Constituent Assembly, an illustrious victim of revolutionary ingratitude.

On what terms did he enter into alliance with the Court? Was his political conscience in unison with the compact? Questions solved for us at the present day in a sense just to this celebrated man, who, on this occasion set a price on his services, but did not sell his opinions. As for Mallet, it was not till at an after period that he noted down in his private diary some details on these combinations, derived from M. de Montmorin and from Malouet:

“Mirabeau, devoted to the King’s interest for a year before his death, had at his command all the money he asked for. ‘He was not interested,’ says M. de Montmorin; ‘I used to give him all he asked for: this has amounted to twelve thousand francs per month.’ The King had secured to him in bills signed by the royal hand, two million five hundred thousand livres, to be paid the moment his plan of counter-revolution was executed. Six months ago M. de Montmorin was still in possession of these ten bills for two hundred and fifty thousand livres each.

“This plan of a counter-revolution was drawn up at M. de Montmorin’s house, in a memorial that still exists, in which the National Assembly is spoken of with horror

and with the deepest contempt. Mirabeau proposed instituting: first, a system of corruption in the tribunals, the sections, the clubs; second, a system of publications; third, inspectors of the registers, to be sent into the departments under pretext of verifying the rolls of taxes, but really to distribute these publications, and so gain over the members of the directories; fourth, to incite the King's departments to send in addresses demanding the dissolution of the Assembly, and the formation of a new legislative body; fifth, M. de Bouillé and his army were to support these addresses. He forwarded this plan to M. de Bouillé, who still retains it."

This is probably only a sketch of the great memorial, which Mirabeau sent the Queen three months before his death. The sketch is undoubtedly somewhat audacious, yet it appears to us uncontradicted by any point in the detailed analysis drawn up by M. Lucas-Montigny of this important work; of which Mirabeau said that with it he had *fathomed the depths of the abyss*.* As to the price

* Now, at length, history will gain possession of all the documents belonging to the long, unprofitable negotiation carried on between Mirabeau and the Court, through the intervention of Count de la Marek. What M. Sainte-Beuve has already made known, in his fine political portrait of Mirabeau ("Constitutionnel," May 5th, 1851), concerning the letters and notes about to be published by M. de Bacourt, is of the most interesting nature, and exalts considerably the estimate of Mirabeau's intentions and political genius. These notes will doubtless show that the Court erred in accepting so late, and following so imperfectly, the counsels of the chief of the Revolution: by bringing him forward as a statesman, these will materially prejudice M. de La Fayette's historical renown, as M. Sainte-Beuve so well remarks; but we venture to predict that

paid for Mirabeau's services, the amount is unimportant, the fact being but too certain. However unwilling we may feel to pass in review these sad proofs of the relaxation of morals and degradation of character at the close of the eighteenth century, justice and truth alike compel us to remember that among the heads of the Constituent Assembly, others beside Mirabeau proved themselves open to bribery. If M. de Montmorin, if such men as Malouet, did not impose on Mallet du Pan, who in his notes merely repeats their testimony, we must believe that the minister actually saw some of those whom Mirabeau had indicated, as attached by anticipation to the project for a restoration; that he offered, and that they accepted pledges of a pecuniary nature. Other deputies also had not delicacy sufficient to resist the temptation presented to them by opportunities of profit, which the immense powers assigned to the truly *executive* committees of the Assembly but too frequently placed within reach of their members. We shall not bring forward the notes in which various individuals are accused, by name, of venality; we naturally hesitate to reproduce proper names, and can sufficiently explain ourselves by quotations from the collection

they will still more strongly exhibit the truly culpable imprudence of our orator's excesses and outbursts in the tribune. "One delights in one's own thunders when they awaken so many echoes," observes his last appreciator, with picturesque truthfulness. This more than witty remark is both apt and weighty; yet we must still admit that the royal party could not accept as pledges of friendship those thunderbolts by which they were scathed; and which inflicted fresh wounds, while they awaited the promised cure of old ones. At any rate, it is certain that Mirabeau was not exempt from the principal fault of the Court—like it, he wasted a great deal of time.

in which Mallet mentions in general terms those deplorable bargains which, impotent to save the monarchy, only degraded yet lower the morality of those concerned.

October, 1791.—"The civil list has been exhausted in purchasing rogues, by odiously employed means. The monarchical club, likewise, has cost an enormous price. All these sums were destined to purchase Court partizans among the mob, the sections, and the national guard, but they who cost the most, are the deputies of the left.

"M. Malouet calling one day at the house of M. Montmorin, saw Duq—— issue from it, and reproached the minister for consorting with such a man. 'I despise him and his colleagues as cordially as you can,' replied M. de M——: 'they are base men; and among all the deputies whom I receive, you are the only one not bribed by the King.'"

CHAPTER X.

(1791.)

Flight from Varennes—Domiciliary visit to Mallet du Pan—On the origin of factions—The King visits the Assembly to sanction the Constitutional Act—Opinion of the “*Mercur*”, on the Constituent Assembly.

AFTER the death of Mirabeau, events seemed hurried forward by a fresh impetus. The departure of the King’s aunts for Italy, and the obstacles thrown in their way, the threatening order laid upon the King not to leave the Tuileries, and the increasing emigration, all added to the importance and the danger of Mallet’s courageous frankness. To avoid too copious quotations from the “*Mercur*,” I reluctantly omit many reflections suggested to him by these incidents, and pass on to the moment when fortune veering about against the masters of the Assembly, surrounded them in their turn with the honourable perils of unpopularity. I will speak of the King’s flight. These Memoirs will cast no new light on this well-known event ; concerning which, Mallet’s journal only contains extracts from the narrative of an officer, which Mallet himself subsequently pronounced inaccurate, and from the manuscript

account written by the Marquis de Bouillé, and since published. The article in the "*Mercur*," on the journey from Varennes was not written by Mallet, for the following reason: on the day of the King's departure, Mallet was returning home with his wife; when, at some two hundred paces from the house he inhabited in the Rue Taranne, he learned that his domicile was in the occupation of a military detachment headed by a commissary of the section.

"On such a day as that of the 21st June," says Mallet, who will best tell his own story, "in the midst of that excessive excitement which reigned throughout Paris, it was only prudent to abandon my house to its self-constituted masters. They cross-questioned my servants in hopes of obtaining from them the locality of our temporary abode; and several among them announced an intention of conducting us to the Abbey of Saint-Germain, a second Bastille, which has shut in more innocent persons within the last two years, than the former confined prisoners during the reign of Louis XVI.

"The envoys of the section examined my papers, my books and my letters; transcribed some of these last, carried away both originals and copies, and securing the rest under seal, left them in the guardianship of two fusiliers. I must confess, that never was arbitrary seizure effected with greater order and forbearance.

"Next day I wrote to the president of the section, to find out the reason of this invasion, and also to provoke the strictest inquiry. A written report prepared at my house, during my absence, although no person was present to represent me, had been forwarded by the section along

with my letters to the Municipal Board of Inquiry. This latter ordered an account of the affair to be drawn up; the decision was accelerated by the good offices of M. Cahier de Gerville, substitute of the procurator syndic of the commune. On the report of this magistrate, I was authorized to require the removal of the seal; but my letters were retained at the National Assembly's Board of Inquiry; finally, by the end of the fortnight, my house was evacuated and I returned home.”*

Meanwhile the newspapers published accounts of the flight, or as some said, the death of the author of the “*Mercure*,” put to death by the patriots in the Rue Taranne. One solitary journalist, M. Parisot, editor of the “*Feuille du jour*,” dared to stand up in his favour; and called attention to the contrast between the persecution undergone by Mallet, and the impunity, or rather protection, accorded to the most infamous libellers. In reality, Mallet did not leave Paris for a single instant.

“I offered no complaint; for the illegal proceedings of the section of the Luxembourg were amply atoned, for as far I was concerned, by the conjecture and excitement to which they had given rise; besides, a man taxed with aristocracy by people who call every one who powders his hair an aristocrat, does not defend his cause at Paris against a section.”*

But he was oppressed by other anxieties than those occasioned by this affair; and on the first opportunity gave energetic expression to his feelings:

“The paltry fact of my ejection was,” he says, “the

* “*Mercure*,” September, 1791, No. 36.

† *Ibid.*

slightest of my cares, at the moment of the King's misfortunes; of a prince who can be accused of only a single weakness, that of having believed men to be as virtuous as himself, and having thus put faith in public integrity; a prince, the solitary individual, perhaps, in his kingdom who ingenuously desired the union of liberty with the monarchy; who had done more for the people's rights than all the sovereigns and demagogues put together of ancient and modern times; who, voluntarily abating his hereditary and unhappily limitless power, in deference to opinion and the desires of the enlightened, had a right to expect exemption from treatment such as Nero never underwent. I was not born under his rule; I would shed my blood to maintain that Republican Government which gave its tone to my childhood, my inclinations, my intellect and my character; but I claim with every generous citizen of a free state, the privilege of lamenting the fate of a King who can neither reward nor punish me."*

By the time that Mallet regained the liberty to write, he had resolved to write no more; and this resolution would have been adhered to, had the King, as might then well be feared, and as voices, already terrible, demanded, been dethroned, and a republic established. The reconciliation of the captive king with the Legislative Assembly, overcame this justifiable repugnance. After two months of silence, during which the "*Mercur*" was ably conducted by Peuchet, Mallet resumed his burdensome employment, but not without giving ample vent to all that weighed upon his heart. In the first place he addressed himself to the supporters of the "*Mercur*," who had

"*Mercur*," September, 1791. No. 36.

shown great dissatisfaction at his inactivity; for in revolutionary periods it is characteristic of what are called good sort of people, to exact rigidly from others sacrifices and proofs of courage:—this species of heroism quiets their own consciences.

“While renewing the assurance of my gratitude, to those who have accompanied their complaints by touching marks of interest and attachment, I must express my surprise at the singular notions entertained by certain persons. They appear to consider an author in such conjunctures as the present, in the light of a servant whom they have engaged to defend their opinions, and who must mount the breach while they sleep or amuse themselves. They find it convenient that some one should undertake, at the risk of his life, liberty, and possessions to serve them up weekly a few pages to satisfy their passions, and be digested with their chocolate: and they regard it as a duty, a debt, that he should sacrifice himself to their indifference and absurd fancies. These gentlemen have captiously endeavoured to convince me, that I had no right to relaxation, that my intrepidity must supply the lack of their’s, and that backed by the approach of counter-revolutionists, it was easy to devote myself to the public good. These certainly are delightful counsels and delightful securities. I reply to these egotists that the limit of my courage is assigned by reason or by feeling; never by the bullying of hot-headed men, who without casting one coin or one drop of blood into the scale of danger, are as Eumenides to hurl in others, but men of straw to extricate them.”

Among the sources of discouragement which had

almost induced Mallet to relinquish his occupation as a political writer, some deserve special notice.

“‘An *inundation of worthless literature*,’ says the observant Montaigne, ‘*indicates a dissolute age*.’ We present a melancholy illustration of this truth. If the excesses of the revolution have encountered no check, if violence has become its sole motive power, if our wise citizens have lost all influence, if fear has paralyzed all courage, even mental; if most of the events have but displayed a conflict between perversity and cowardice, if throughout many catastrophes we have met with so few of those generous sentiments, those great deeds, which have shone forth during the most horrible revolutions—we must unquestionably acknowledge, as among the fundamental causes of this state of things, the impression stamped upon our manners by our *inundation of worthless literature* and relaxed habits. Everyone has sought safety in pamphlets. The oppressors have used them as a magazine of tyranny; the oppressed have relinquished to printers the task of avenging them. Having discharged a volley of abuse at the National Assembly, and of impotent threats at its chiefs, it is believed that the claims of one’s country are satisfied. The readers of these diatribes, comforted, almost triumphant, and finding victory in every page, have rested confidently on the prodigious effect of these pamphlets, forgotten a week after their appearance. In the midst of all our disorders and misfortunes, they have only regarded the revolution as a skirmish of discussions, eloquence, and invectives. When we accustom ourselves to judge and feel by proxy, we become incapable of the smallest personal efforts. What we gain in

pleasure, we lose in energy of character. The soul's activity, a sacred fire which, unlike that of the intellect, never decays, becomes weakened in the midst of so many disputes. Yet men are designed to act, rather than to read, in times of social disorder. Wherever you recognise a contrary course, you will also discern symptoms of degeneracy: men immersed in the sea of printed fooleries are no longer capable of self-guidance: from them look neither for greatness nor for energy: these courtly rushes will bow down beneath the impetuous winds, and arise no more."*

During the latter days of 1791, the "*Mercur politique*" maintained the elevated position to which Mallet had raised it. Some articles on the Origin of Factions specially deserve notice. At the moment when the Assembly was about to cede their stage to other actors, Mallet thought it might be advantageous to enumerate the vent-holes of that conflagration, with which party spirit had undermined France. He commenced by stating the essential difference which separates legislators from founders of faction. He demonstrated by the concurrent testimony of history, what are those causes which produce the plague of political sects; and sorrowfully observed, while casting a rapid glance on the state of France, that all these causes appeared united in that unhappy country, to perpetuate its disturbance and laceration. Proceeding from these general considerations to their particular application, he undertook to enumerate and characterize the various parties to which were abandoned the National Assembly and France under its rule. This is a masterly picture and

* "*Mercur*," September, 1791. No. 36.

will be of essential service to future generations : sketched less hurriedly, with more correctness of style, and a more delicate pencil, this would rank among the valuable passages of modern history. Such as it is, it possesses considerable merit ; but the extent and unbroken thread of the treatise preventing us from quoting from it, we can only refer our readers to the papers themselves.*

At length the Assembly approached the consummation of their labours. The King came forward solemnly to sanction his acceptance of the constitutional act, and swear fidelity to the law and the nation. The “*Mercur*” gave the following concise account of the proceedings, a recital rich with the simple eloquence of facts :

“ They had recommenced working at the organization of forest regulations, when an usher announced, ‘ The King.’ The Assembly rose—the majority of the right had disappeared.

“ His Majesty entered without his blue ribbon, placed himself on the left of the President, and said :

“ ‘ Gentlemen, I come hither to sanction solemnly my acceptance of the constitutional act. For this reason I swear fidelity to the nation and the law, and to employ all the power delegated to me in maintaining the Constitution decreed by the National Constituent Assembly, and in executing the laws. May the re-establishment of peace and union date from this great and memorable epoch, and may this become the pledge of happiness to the people, and prosperity to the empire.’

“ At the moment when the King pronounced the

* These articles on the Origin of a Faction are to be found in the “*Mercur*” for August, September, and October, pp. 229, 49, 125.

words, 'I swear fidelity to the nation,' the Assembly resumed their seats, and Louis XVI., for the first time in his life—the King of France, for the first time since the foundation of the monarchy—stood to swear fidelity to his seated subjects; but these, having possession of the sovereignty, beheld in the King merely their highest salaried functionary, legally liable to dethronement. Having uttered the words: 'National Constituent Assembly,' the King, becoming aware, that he alone was standing, traversed the chamber with a look in which benevolence was even more visible than surprise. His Majesty sat down and continued his discourse.

“Everywhere resounded cries of, ‘Long live the King!’ The chancellor presented the Constitution to him for signature; the Assembly stood up; the King signed; the Assembly reseated itself; and M. Thouret, the president, having only risen for the first words: ‘Abuses of long standing,’—and then sitting down with fraternal and civic familiarity, read his discourse to the King.”*

On the breaking up of the Constituent Assembly, with the declaration that their mission was accomplished, Mallet summed up the opinions he had at various times pronounced on the legislators and their work. Accustomed as we are to think of them with that respect and admiration which is due to their early proceedings, though the majority of their acts compromised them too soon, we shall find Mallet's conclusions extremely severe, yet scarcely be able to contest their truth.

“Only by denying positive and authenticated facts, the Constituent Assembly hides from itself that its doctrine

* *Journal de l'Assemblée Nationale*, September 16, 1791. N. 27.

and operations annihilate all religious principle; leave our morals in the lowest state of abasement; every vice at full liberty; the right of possession attacked and sapped at its very foundation; our military and naval forces in a worse condition than when the rule of the Assembly commenced; that it has shaken, if not annihilated, all military organization; that it has left our finance ruined—our national debt considerably augmented, the annual deficit increased by one-half, according to the most favourable calculations—the imposts in arrear suspended, their principle attacked by the daring of an absolutely new system, of which the immediate consequence has been to accustom the people to believe themselves freed from taxes. It cannot hide from itself that our influence and standing in Europe are lowered, that our trade is less flourishing, our manufactures are less productive, our population is less numerous; that the amount of labour has decreased in proportion with the national wealth; that it has caused the circulating medium to disappear, and dissipated an enormous fund of public capital; finally, that our internal police, notwithstanding its numerous overseers, is more oppressive and less effective than it was before the Revolution.

“We will add, what cannot be disputed, that the number of the abject poor has in all states reached a frightful height; that misery and despair cover, as with the awfulness of death, the songs of triumph, the illuminations, the *Fête Deum*, and the addresses of congratulation. I do not speak of the clergy and the nobility, their profession and their birth being crimes in the eyes of the dominant party. Their misfortunes are doubtless

legitimate punishments; and four or five hundred individuals, having constituted themselves inviolable, have a right to dispose of their fate, as the judge disposes of the fate of malefactors; but I ask to be shown, with the exception of the stock-jobbers, a single class of Frenchmen whose fortune has not declined, whose resources and comforts are not painfully abridged?

“ To appreciate the conduct of our chief legislators, we must dismiss the sophistries with which they constantly fascinate the vulgar, by contrasting the present condition of France with the disastrous results of the most horrible despotism. That is a false assumption, to which deceivers and dupes always take care to recur. An immense number of citizens has no more taste for the new system than for the old; and it is not on the reformation of the first that those reproaches fall, with which they overwhelm the second. To conquer their disapproval, it must be proved, that, without the doings of the Assembly, without the public and private calumnies they have caused, France would never have obtained liberty, protection of property, and of personal security, which is the first condition of good government; peace, which is its sign; political equality, abundance, strength, order, universal respect. It must be proved, besides, that the Assembly had not the option of other institutions—that no middle course was possible, and that it proclaimed the only suitable government, because no other offered such certain advantages or a future more evidently satisfactory. *

CHAPTER XI.

1791—1792.

The Legislative Assembly—The “*Mercure*” declares against war—Political condition of Europe—Uneasiness of the minority of the Assembly—Secret intrigues against the Jacobins—Committees, projects for saving the King—Private notes of Mallet du Pan—Decrees of the Assembly relative to the assassins of Avignon, the colonies, and the emigrants—The Brissot ministry—Mallet’s final articles in the “*Mercure de France*.”

THE position of the “*Mercure*,” and the estimation which it had procured its editor, had long made Mallet’s house the rendezvous of the most important politicians of the various fractions of the moderate party, who passed the evening with him, after quitting the Constituent Assembly, to talk over the sitting and the state of the Revolution, and to determine on motions and future deliberations.

Here they found themselves on neutral ground, and at their ease, for they knew that Mallet was in the interest of no party. His conversation was sure to be instructive; his political knowledge and experience were tried, and might be consulted in full confidence. Forty years afterwards, M. de Talleyrand spoke with the most marked

esteem of the men of this circle and of Mallet himself, whose fire he had to stand, but whose praise he had obtained, in reference to some of his speeches.

Ever ready to defend the King with all his power, and naturally allied to the moderate party, whose general tendencies he represented, Mallet did not therefore consider himself bound to follow the Court party in their continually shifting projects and doings; neither did he embrace the unstable tactics of the upstart moderates, who flattered themselves that by their contrivances they might save, at one stroke, the King and the Revolution. He continued as frankly as ever to give judgment on events, measures and parties; sometimes maybe too harshly, and without making sufficient allowance for weak counsels, nor a fair acknowledgment of the good intentions which frequently accompanied political errors. It must, however, be conceded that the moves were so critical, the stake so momentous, as to render it difficult for a man like Mallet, deeply interested and strongly moved by the vicissitudes of the impending game, not to bear a little too hardly on the players.

Towards the end of the year 1791, while he displayed a premature severity towards the new men of the Ministry of Lessart, Louis de Narbonne, Cahier de Gerville,* &c.,

* Cahier de Gerville was like Roland, one of those fanatics of liberty who esteem themselves sublime when they are only insolent; of austere virtue when merely gross. "Cahier de Gerville wished the King to take the newly imposed oath to the municipality, with his new guard, and proposed his doing so to the council. His infamous motion fell to the ground. He spoke insultingly of the King, even in open court. He was then placed in custody, and he observed, 'he observed'

"who," said he, "without possessing the experience and knowledge requisite for the comprehensive management of a great empire, had the condescension to govern it, under circumstances which would have made a Richelieu, an Oxenstiern, or a Chatham tremble." He warmly defended M. de Montmorin against the royalists, and resolutely withdrew himself from the partisans of war.

The Revolution was now hurrying with hasty strides to the twofold aim towards which its democratic character tended; to the persecution of the French who were day by day impelled to despair, and to war with all the dynasties of Europe. Mallet says, somewhere, that "it is of the very essence of democracy to gravitate towards the pole when no obstacle interposes."*

In the month of October, Brissot, who governed at will the diplomatic committee, rose in his place in the midst of thundering applause to declare war with Europe; he founded the urgent necessity of such a step on the crimes which he imputed to thirty sovereign powers, monarchical or republican, Geneva and Berne coming in for their share of invectives.†

Madame Elizabeth having sent for him, he received the message with haughty impatience, and when the Princess requested his good offices in favour of a nun, he replied: "Indeed, Madam, had I known the purpose for which you sent for me, I should not have left what I was about." He boasted in council of this retort. "If Madame Elisabeth," replied the Minister of Marine, "admired your devotion to business, she cannot have admired your politeness."—Notes of Mallet du Pan.

* *Alteure*, 1791, No. 3.

† A Swiss minister, on this occasion that a number of Swiss citizens were brought into the dungeons of the Bastille.

To these first threats, the publication of which was decreed by the Assembly, others rapidly succeed. The members talk of drawing the circle of Popilius round the petty Princes of Germany, of forcing them to disperse the emigrants forthwith; should they refuse, of praying the King to summon them to do so and declare war within the fortnight. Isnard supports the motion, declares that the great powers will remain neutral, and that "the nations will embrace before the face of tyrants dethroned, earth vindicated, and heaven well-pleased."

Finally, M. de Vaublanc, at the head of a deputation, intimated to the King the line of conduct demanded of him: "The nation expects of you energetic declarations; prescribe an early date beyond which no dilatory answer will be accepted. Let your declaration be supported by the movements of the forces confided to you." Mallet remarked on this occasion:

"The exaggerations, the bloodthirsty invectives addressed from the tribunes of the Jacobins and of the National Assembly to all the powers, the violent resolutions to which we have been led, had been indignantly repelled by the moderate party, the ministerial, the constitutional, when their fiery adversaries proposed to them, six weeks previously, to declare war, and proclaim liberty to all the nations. Such has been," he observed, "the influence of the Jacobins, or such the weakness of their opponents, that the former have dragged the latter in their train. Both parties

Castle of Chillon, and that their feet were bathed by the sea-water. Brissot indeed, had represented the Duke of Alva, as hunting to death Maurice, who, at the period alluded to, had not completed his seventh year.

then engaged in a struggle for popularity, and in a rivalry of headlong revolutions."

Elsewhere, Mallet accounts as follows for the unanimity of desires in parties who were mutually odious :

"The Jacobin Committee, the Constitutional Committee, His Majesty's Council, royalists of various denominations, all agree in desiring war. Perhaps necessity gives rise to this murderous appeal, to which men's passions return a prompt answer. Some see no means of maintaining the actual state of things ; others are impatient to see it overturned ; a third party long for any sort of result ; national impetuosity drives numbers towards a catastrophe, of which few men indeed foresee the nature, and fewer still the means. All parties are full of confidence : on the one side no doubt is felt of subduing France by approaching the frontiers ; on the other is a conviction that to announce an intention of passing them will suffice to annihilate all resistance."

As to Mallet, he expresses himself with energy :

"I withdraw from the ranks of all, whosoever they be, who invoke war : it is impossible for a true friend of this monarchy to think of its approach without terror. It cannot but be lamented that before reaching this dreadful extremity, no means were sought to avert it ; that during the three last years of fearful discord, the destiny of the state, of its laws, of liberty, of public order, of factions which acknowledge no other alternative but that of mutual destruction, should have been given over to main force. It cannot but be deplored that not one conciliatory word was audible above the roar of hatred ; that they agreed in

conceding nothing—in marching on from destruction to destruction without a thought for the future. This morality will assuredly displease those who have banished morality from policy, or in whom the word harmony stirs up rage, and even that bevy of irresolute minds and hollow hearts who, while assuming the hypocritical insignia of moderation, have never uttered one moderate sentence or performed one moderate action.”*

Mallet was not satisfied with merely writing these articles for the “*Mercur*.” In concert with Malouet, he had imparted to the King, through M. de Montmorin, before this minister’s withdrawal, a course which was looked upon as too daring. His notes, in November 1791, contain the following: “M. de Montmorin was the strong man of the ministry, at the moment of his resignation. Malouet and I had persuaded him to propose a course of action to the King, and to avail himself legally of circumstances. In particular, to go to the National Assembly, and tell them that the foreign powers (whose despatches he would have produced), considering him not a free agent, it was necessary to prove his freedom; that he required, therefore, to go to Fontainebleau or Compiègne, accompanied by his own guards, to choose a new ministry, which had not in any way co-operated in framing or passing the constitution. Either the National Assembly would have refused, and thus established the restraint of the King; or it would have accepted, and the King would have delivered himself from the traitors in his council, and composed one vigorous, and consisting of

* “*Mercur*,” December, 1791, No. 51.

attached royalists. M. de Montmorin insisted thrice over: he kneeled to the Queen. All was vain: the fear of consequences and of an insurrection prevailed."

In the month of January, Mallet renewed his prophetic declarations:

"I have said, and shall continue to repeat, what early experience will re-echo still more forcibly, that war will complete the dissolution of the monarchy, and will make it change masters. The emigrants, the occasion of the war, will be lost for ever if it is unfavourable to them, without any accession of strength to the new constitution through their defeat. It is not, I venture to predict, for the preservation of the throne, for any class of friends to monarchical government in France, that our armies will triumph. Should they be repulsed, the monarchy—the laws—true liberty, will again be at the mercy of might. The exasperated conquerors will not stickle for conciliation; and, if we be favoured with a constitution, it will, perhaps, be moulded of the cannon which has served to overthrow to-day's.

"Perhaps the sovereigns might be over-confident in hoping to resolve the crisis by the sole force of their armies. If they do not call opinion to their aid, if they do not oppose to the rights of man, which will be employed to rouse their subjects to revolt, a popular charter, showing the interests of all in the preservation of public order and legitimate government, the excesses of the French Revolution will subvert Europe from end to end.

"The uneasiness excited by the aggregations at Coblenz, that point of support for every expression of discontent, that beam of hope offered to all who have injuries to

avenge, who complain of oppression, who see usurpers in all the actual masters of the realm, has doubtless supplied powerful motives for the resolutions of the National Assembly: but, to pluck out this thorn, does it not resign itself to a mortal amputation? How is it that the interest of the people and the constitution has induced it to prefer, among all the means of preserving the emigrants, the very one which will evidently unite crowned heads in their cause? Its decrees have already produced what two years of efforts, movements, solicitations from without, awful events from within, had not effected. They have changed demonstrations of interest towards the refugees into the necessity of defending them; they have united what should have been kept apart, the cause of these refugees, and that of the Germanic Empire and Europe; they have created motives where only pretexts existed; and, by dictating the law to the German princes, in matters affecting their own territories, they will have been induced to defend their independence, unless, indeed, fear should paralyze them; which is not without some likelihood."

The concluding words will have shown that Mallet du Pan did not deceive himself. To his historic and philosophical appreciation, the revolution, such as it displayed itself, was not a great venture long pending, still less the arousing of the human race, and the sublime conquest of its rights. It was henceforward in his eyes the spirit of revolution burning to measure its strength against subject Europe, in order to conquer it.

"A doctrine is arising, which makes liberty consist in

* "Mercure," January, 1792, No. 1.

force exercised by the majority or the most violent ; and which sees universal equality in the restoration of all those rights which nature bestowed on man at the day of creation. This doctrine is no theorist's dream : for three years a great empire has been experiencing its application. The restless spirit of all countries—men of every class ruined in honour and fortune—the covetous spendthrifts, who, having squandered their patrimony, cannot tolerate those who retain theirs ; the fanatical innovators who preach reason, dagger in hand ; the raving fools who admire them ; the indigent, the non-proprietary, the immense horde of envious, malignant men of no account, to whom disorder opens the door to riches and to public offices ; all the ingrates whom a day of revolution acquits of obligation to their benefactors—in fine, the mob of beings without vice, and without virtue, indifferent to good and evil, passive instruments of the perversity which overawes them : such are the promoters and the auxiliaries of this system.

“ In no part of the world, perhaps, did more fruitful causes of success exist for the authors of a social crash. Parcelled out into a multitude of different governments, Europe offers but few of the bases of a combined resistance ; and the first great continental nation which changes the face of society has only severed limbs to dread. The political interests of all the remainder of the earth are less complicated than those we display : an intricate system of complex treaties, multiplied relations, innumerable secondary considerations, manœuvres, suspicions, safeguards, compose our public law. By the multitude of conventions which restrain sovereigns, we may calculate the sources of discord ever ready to agitate them : we no

longer repose after great conquests, for these are no longer possible ; but we sleep armed *cap-à-pie* in the bosom of peace, and every one keeps anxious watch over the arsenal of public compacts. We carry on warfare by means of the most incompatible alliances, of which the object changes momentarily with circumstances. A state of moderate size carries on more diplomatic affairs than the Empire of China ; the connexions of each sovereign extend now-a-days from one end of Europe to the other. The necessity of a political balance, which arises from a desire to maintain the independence of weak states, and prevent the aggrandisement of the more powerful, calls for unflinching vigilance and unceasing movement in the cabinets.

“The jarring of so many wheels renders apparent the difficulty of making the machine work in unity, and of impelling towards an uniform object the activity divided among so many distinct interests. In consequence of the political character assumed by Europe for the last century, and the nature of those conventions on which it is based, it has become difficult to act for the general good upon a score of sovereigns possessed with a mutual dread, and whom their ministers have accustomed these hundred years to establish their safety on indifference to the danger of all those states, which they suspect may be in a position to injure them some day.

“Let us then cease to be surprised at the alarms which influence, at the public or secret broils which have absorbed, three parts of Europe, ever since France undertook, most probably without effect, to give a fearful lesson to nations and to governments.”*

* “*Mercur*,” January, 1792, No. 2.

The diplomatic history of the Northern states for the preceding two years, more than justified these conclusions of Mallet. Until the middle of '91, their attention and their forces had been engrossed by the Russian and Turkish wars, and by those other contests which England and Prussia were suspected of having encouraged, in order to oppose some barrier to Russian encroachments in the North and the Levant. But suddenly, by a sort of simultaneous inspiration, all wills united; and in August a general peace, accelerated probably by the state of things in France, took place. Nevertheless, Leopold II. gave no sign in his actions of any interest in the situation of his brother-in-law, although Louis XVI. and the daughter of the Cæsars were (in the words of our author) for the second time, led back to the capital with the pomp of savages who have captured their enemy. Perhaps he deemed his interference dangerous, at a crisis which the delirium of a moment might render desperate. All he did was from Padua; to invite all powers unitedly to interpose between the French monarch and the new arbiters of the destiny of kings; a merely threatening and consequently ineffectual proceeding, which sufficiently demonstrated, according to Mallet's remark at the time, how little was understood of the character of a tumultuous democracy, to whom a distant danger always appears chimerical. In reality, this proceeding, equally insignificant and pretentious, left Louis XVI. under the necessity, either of assenting to the conditions imposed upon him in the interior, or of braving the consequences of resistance. He signed everything that was offered

to him. Then it was that at Pilnitz, where the Emperor and the King of Prussia had met by appointment, men appeared to remember the sufferings of the unfortunate monarch. "Outwardly acceding to the urgent applications made by the brothers of Louis XVI., the Emperor and the King of Prussia had signed at Pilnitz an unmeaning convention, rendered superfluous by the last acts of the King of France. They had not assembled at Pilnitz for this; they had gone there to conclude an alliance proposed between the Houses of Austria and Brandenburg; and, satisfied with a demonstration of interest which the emigrants hastened to publish as a decisive manifestation, the two sovereigns at once returned to their former neutrality: not one of their soldiers stirred; the constitution received by the King of France, on quitting prison and under pain of dethronement, paralyzed this treaty of Pilnitz, which politicians place under the head of august and solemn farces."*

But the hour of diplomatic farces was past; of this the outcries raised by the Jacobins in the Assembly apprised the foreign powers; the provoking acts of the legislative body, and that fanatical impetuosity which carried away the French and found vent in the most insulting menaces, decided the courts of Vienna and Berlin on adopting effectual measures whereby to avenge these provocations, and vindicate the dignity of the powers. Meanwhile, spectators of these schemes, the emigrants and the princes stood silent in the sight of that country which they had quitted and were preparing to re-enter. Mallet viewed

* "Mercure," February, 1792, No. 5.

this silence as the result of an ill-assumed dignity ; and openly avowed his opinion in words which excited indignation beyond the frontiers :

“The emigrant princes and their council have hitherto maintained a profound silence concerning all the accusations, counter-statements and decrees, of which they are the object. We must know the motives of this reserve if we are to approve of it : for it casts a slur on the emigrants ; it lowers them even in the eyes of their countrymen, who judge them on the score of imputations which are not yet disproved. Contempt for one’s enemies is a sorry counsellor. Reputation abandons those who affect to disregard it, under the idea that every one will acquit them, while they take no pains to confute their accusers. Thus Henry IV. published manifestoes every month. With what spirit, with what open and patriotic energy did this hero and his cousins, Louis and Henry de Condé, depict their grievances to the nation ! They did more—they made their own wants one with those of their people ; and it was by the zeal with which they burned for the interests of the nation, that they succeeded in re-attaching it to their own cause.”*

While events hastened onwards, and the hour of sounding the tocsin drew nigh, a project for consummating the humiliation of royal authority and annihilating it, was steadily drawn out in the Legislative Assembly. Within, the minority, timid or inattentive, offered scarcely any opposition to the current of events ; without, they acted, or dreamed of acting, in those committees in which the moderate party, the remnants of the oppressed Feuillantins,

* “*Mercure*,” January, 1792, No. 1.

overcome by the Jacobins, conceived a thousand plans for saving the King and themselves with him, all of the same mind, whatever their plans ; in the same way the court looked for safety in intrigue rather than in the King's acts.

Mallet never took part in any of those permanent or temporary committees which became so frequent after the return from Varennes, when the chiefs of the majority, suddenly opening their eyes to the necessity for resistance, undertook in their turn to set bounds to the Revolution and secure their own conquests and ascendancy by secret alliances with their ancient adversaries of the minority ; in virtue of which, the latter, more connected than themselves with the court, were to furnish them with means, either direct or indirect, of superintending the King's interests. The intentions and negociations of most of these converts, were, we must confess, little heeded by the editor of the "Mercure." The court sent him no invitation to its councils ; he was never seen at the castle. Only once, in the November of 1791, did the Queen send him by her physician some information to be inserted in the "Mercure." Of this communication, thus given in the notes already referred to, the reader may form his own judgment :

"M. Vicq-d'Azyr has been directed by the Queen to inform me, for my guidance and in confidence,

"1stly. That she and the King made use of every imaginable effort, before the King's escape, to prevail on the Emperor to assist them ;

"2ndly. That it was not M. de Breteuil, but M. de Mercy, who advised and conducted the escape.

3rdly. That the certainty of the Emperor's assistance

abandoned them, has alone induced them to accept and adopt their present plan of conduct ;

“4thly. That she is overwhelmed with the calumnies propagated against her by the aristocrats of Coblenz and Worms ; that it is false that she has sought to alienate the Emperor from these, and equally untrue that she or the King ever held a conference with André, Barnave, Lameth, Thouret, &c. &c.

“5thly. That it is absurd to accuse the princes of jealousy, since the character of the King renders it impossible that they should not exercise the greatest influence over him in every affair.”

Of these various pieces of information, some were transferred to the “*Mercur*,” where Mallet made use of them to confirm the inductions of his political articles, others are recorded from time to time in his private notes. In these memoranda we find the following details, dated in the earlier months of 1792 :

“The ministry was split into two parties ; the one, arranged and governed by Lameth, Duport, Baumetz and Barnave, comprehended de Lessart and the keeper of the seals, to whom Bertrand joined himself, though not strictly belonging to them. It was the plan of the leaders to cause the existing Assembly to be dismissed, to excite the departments to petition against it, to recall the constituents, and to amend the constitution by an elective upper chamber, and by other means. From this party issued a host of posters, pamphlets, and placards, against the Jacobins. De Lessart was most lavish of money : they had secured Suleau, Desmoulins, and a hundred more scribe-

blers, coffee-house politicians, &c. Lameth, a consummate dealer in intrigues of this class, had endeavoured to resume the thread of his former operations, and to renew the activity of the ruffians he had previously employed.

“The second ministerial plan and party had for its chiefs Narbonne, La Fayette, and Madame de Staël. To them is attributed a project to transport the King to Fontainebleau, and the to place him at the head of the army, which they confidently hoped to renovate and bring back to a state of discipline. They had already begun the work; and La Fayette had had tolerable success at Metz. They intended to allow the King to select for his body-guard the regiments on which most dependence could be placed.

“The other party, when informed of this plan, thwarted it. Hatred between de Lessart, Bertrand, and Narbonne. The latter requests his discharge—a concerted plan to procure the dismissal of the other two, particularly of the more stubborn Bertrand.”

These manœuvres, set on foot by persons who were perpetually boasting of their devotion to the National Assembly, were in the eyes of Mallet acts of inexcusable perfidy: he speaks of them in his notes with a severity, perhaps too unqualified. In his judgments of political personages, he often failed to allow them due credit for their good intentions; his friends made this a subject of reproach to him, and he himself was ever ready to seize the least opportunity of modifying or recalling unfavourable opinions too strongly expressed. He had judged harshly

of M. de Narbonne. "A public man," said he one day in speaking of him, "should show no spirit but in behalf of his cause." Soon after he saw reason to alter his view. He says :

"This minister has been too severely censured: we should make allowances for him; and while we cannot approve of those exaggerated expressions by means of which he hoped to overcome mistrust, we ought to do justice to his activity, to his good intentions, to his plans for restoring order to the army, and replacing it under the influence of its legitimate chiefs."

In March, Mallet writes :

"Madame de Staël had caused to be conveyed to the King and Queen a proposal to remove them in her carriage, at the departure of the ambassador; the Queen in the disguise of a housekeeper, the King in that of a steward, in a black wig, and the Dauphin dressed as a girl. No other person was to be allowed to accompany them. The Queen warmly signified her assent to the Chevalier de Coigny."

The plan of the converts, Dupont, Lameth, La Fayette (who, at length, with Narbonne, had joined them), was to transport the King to Fontainebleau, to give him a few regiments, to let the commotions at Paris take their course, and to assign the excited state of the capital as the motive for selecting a more distant retreat. He was to be conducted to the army, prepared to receive him by La Fayette and Toulangeon, who answered for Luckner: the Assembly was to be dismissed, and the King alone to select and name a new one, composed of men of property, dis-

tinguished by their experience, or talents, who would simply have formed a Council of Notables, and would have sanctioned a plan of government addressed to them by Louis."

April 1792.—"On the 18th of March, 1792, I read a paper vouched for by good authorities, in which it is affirmed that the plan of the chiefs of the Jacobins is not precisely a republic, but a change of dynasty, as they are of opinion that the King will remain attached to the nobility, and care little for the constitution. They have accordingly offered the crown to the Duke of Brunswick. As an opening, they had engaged the late ministry, Narbonne, de Lessart, &c., to propose for the Duke's acceptance the command in chief of the national army. The ministers fell into the snare, and, with very different views, wrote to the Duke, who refused. It seems as if this Prince's recent visit to Potsdam, where he conferred with the King of Prussia, coincided with his refusal of this offer. The leaders have not, on this account, desisted from their project; the embassy of Messrs. d'Autun and Chauvelin to London is probably connected with it, as well as M. de Custine's sojourn at Brunswick, whence he has proceeded to Berlin. (We cannot, however, assert that these three negotiators are aware of the secret object of their mission.) By inducing England and the Duke to adopt this plan, and by the offer of still further advantages, it is hoped to detach Prussia from the House of Austria. The means contrived to dethrone the King, are to cause the National Assembly to declare that he has lost the confidence of the nation. MM. Condorcet, Brissot, and others, are merely the instruments—the agents of the enterprise: the author

and head of it being the Abbé Sieyès. His fundamental doctrine is, that, in order to establish the revolution, it is indispensably necessary to change both the religion and the dynasty. He manages everything without the semblance of doing so : his pride will not brook a superior : he has abolished the aristocracy because he does not belong to the class : possessing nothing, his aim is to destroy everything. He is particularly clever in securing his object without seeming to aim at it ; in preparing others for ulterior views which had never entered into their heads ; in being sparing of his words in public, and in acting busily in secret. What would seem to afford some pretence for his absurd project is, that, since the nomination of the new ministry, the King has been not the less open to abuse in pamphlets and newspapers, and the butt of the speakers in the Jacobin club. We may instance the discourse of M. Guadet, one of Brissot's set, in which he undisguisedly asserts that the King had to choose between reigning at Coblenz or over a free people. See also the speech of M. Le Clerc d'Oze to the Jacobins.

“ Yet there does not less exist a party of true republicans, with M. Robespierre at their head, who do not follow the lead of MM. Condorcet and Brissot. The Abbé Sieyès said last week, in the hearing of one of my friends, that the Queen ought to be sent back as soon as possible, but with the greatest delicacy.

“ It cannot be doubted that the illusory hope of securing the support of the Princess and the Duke of Brunswick, will probably drive the party of Sieyès, Brissot, &c., to war. In such a crisis, means will easily be found to make the

King a party concerned, and to turn against him the decree above mentioned.”*

Be that as it may, dating from the month of March, the power of the Jacobins was manifest, and already so formidable, that they could only be attacked covertly, as Mallet observes, and with anonymous weapons, suitable for nothing but the wrangling of idle wenches. “We have among the royalists anonymous writers of tremendous courage, who get rid of all the revolutionists in one paragraph; all their talk is of hanging, exterminating, subjugating. They are so wonderfully valorous, that when safely ensconced at Coblenz or Tournai, they make indiscriminate slaughter of Jacobins, constitutionalists, and the partisans of monarchy.”

“They call partisans of monarchy,” continues Mallet, in a curious note, “all those who, horror-struck by the horrors of the Revolution, by the atrocious acts of injustice consequent on it, by the madness of the anarchists, earnestly desire a King, nobles, clergy and regular government; in union with the recognition of the just claims of the people, liberty, public rights, authority within the limits requisite for the security of him who is to command, as well as of those whose part it is to obey. They do me the honour to style me chief of the impious and sacrilegious sect—that sect whose desire it is to shield us from fresh revolutions, by making it the interest of all classes of the state to further the maintenance of the monarchy.

* Compare these notes with the “*Mémoires tirés des papiers d'un homme d'État* :” the exact conformity of the facts mentioned, proves the veracity of both sources.

The admirers of absolute sway sentence to the parliamentary gallows as soon as they succeed in re-establishing that tribunal, all the favourers of the system of two chambers. This last instance of folly is all that was wanting to prove to foreigners the profound wisdom of our counsels. One of those brave scribblers, who deems it prudent at the safe distance of sixty miles from the frontiers to preserve his incognito, and who taxes with cowardice all who during three years have borne the brunt of the strife at Paris, has just gone through the ceremony of my trial. The sentence he pronounced on my delinquency at Coblenz, has been reprinted at Paris under the taking title of, '*Incredible policy of the Monarchists, or Letter to M. Mallet du Pan, chief or coryphee of the Sect, &c.*'"

At Paris the agitators always got the upper hand; particularly in coffee-houses and theatres, the Jacobins struck their adversaries to the ground by a wave of the tri-coloured flag. Still the intrepid "Mercure" refused to bow submission, or to lower his tone. His pen trembling with indignation, he gave his readers a picture of Paris and the departments. On the 10th of March, 1792, we find him drawing this bold sketch:

"Paris is infested with banditti, and no repressive means are employed against them; everybody finds fault with the police; the city authorities dispute with those of the department; ministers do nothing but pay compliments to the Assembly, and keep aloof from the galleys; denunciations abound; infamous addresses are voted to the King, printed and circulated; omens of an impending subversion of the state are easily discernible; none

sleep peacefully except the disturbers of the public peace. All the activity of the Committee of Vigilance and of the officers of the police is expended on domiciliary visits, instituted on the reports of wretches wholly unworthy of credit. No citizen can feel sure that he will sleep in his bed: arbitrary warrants are issued to enforce a search in most respectable houses, under pretence that arms or forged bank-notes are retained; and to crown all, this horrible spirit of inquisition is enforced with unmitigated severity.

“ Misrule is still more striking in many of the departments. In one place they exhume the dead, if the deceased has been attended by a non-juring priest. In another, an administrative body, in defiance of the law privately charter, in a town assigned to them in common, all the non-conforming ecclesiastics. The insurrection in Picardy is still unrepressed, where five thousand armed brigands or agitators are seen overrunning the department of l'Eure, laying taxes on grain, perpetrating numberless acts of violence, and threatening to besiege Evreux. At Etampes, we see M. Simoneau, the mayor, shot and pierced to death in the midst of the National Guard; at Montlhéry, a farmer chopped to pieces. Dunkirk dreads a renewal of the acts of pillage of the past month; in the department of the Haute-Garonne, barns are broken into, houses burned, fines levied on householders, in whose dwellings (more especially in Toulouse and its neighbourhood) the clubs have made free to billet strangers; everybody looks forward to a general pillage; the levying of the taxes becomes more and more difficult; landlords dare not demand their rents; should they make the attempt, their bailiffs are

nurdered; woods belonging to private parties are not only laid waste, but in many places the municipal authorities appropriate them by regular form of law.

“The day has arrived when proprietors of every class must at last feel that their turn is come to fall under the axe of anarchy. They will have to expiate the sin of which many of them were guilty when they sought to justify the first acts of rapine, giving to robbers the noble designation of patriots; they will be doomed to expiate the apathy with which they viewed the dissolution of Government, the arming of a whole nation, the destruction of all authority by the insane creation of a multitude of insubordinate powers, and the fatal blow aimed against the police in their protective functions. Let them not deceive themselves: things continuing as they are, their ancestral heritages must become the prey of superior force. There no longer exists any law, or government, or authority capable of contesting their patrimony with a daring body of armed beggars, who have set up their standard and prepare for an universal sack.”*

These pictures enraged the revolutionists, who, not yet victims of the Revolution, were proud to push on its car, which they imagined themselves to guide. Truth, concerning France, was in their eyes positive calumny; their enthusiasm stood them in stead of justice and logic, as ere long became evident. At the very time that the Assembly pardoned Jourdan Coupe-Tête and the assassins of Avignon;† in those same days when Vergniaud,

* “*Mercure*,” March, 1792, No. 10.

† According to Brissot’s theory, this pardon was a mere act of justice; because the assassins represented almost the whole of society

Thurot, &c., affirmed that in a period of revolution, justice must keep silence, the Assembly aimed another decree at all the emigrants without distinction ; punishing with the loss of all their property, those whom discontent, anarchy, or other motives, had induced to quit the kingdom, although scarcely half of them had taken part in the counter-revolutionary meeting of Coblenz : " And yet," said Mallet du Pan to these virtuous and humane logicians, " these families, now scattered abroad in so many countries, left the kingdom on the faith of solemn laws, which forbid tyrants to impose restraints on the liberty of going and returning, of travelling and sojourning beyond the French confines." The legislative body, suddenly and without warning, substituted its own will in the place of these inviolable laws, and by a retrospective action punished a lawful absence.

This was not all. To the despairing cries of the yet surviving inhabitants of unhappy St. Domingo, who had escaped massacre and conflagration, the Assembly responded by applying to the colonies its principles of revolutionary justice. Barnave had successfully carried through the Constituent Assembly a decree securing to the colonial parliaments, provided the King gave his sanction to the arrangement, all laws relating to the political position of negroes and men of colour. This decree was set aside in utter contempt of that fundamental principle of the constitution, that no man is bound by a law to which he has not assented either in person, or by his representatives ;

in their violent punishment of certain individuals (the unhappy persons murdered at Avignon) who offered criminal opposition to the general will, suddenly and tumultuously expressed.

and the Assembly, while arrogating to itself the right of arbitrarily deranging the condition of others, proclaimed equality of political rights in the colonies. This was to decree the ruin of the colonists.

A minority of barely two hundred voices had opposed the amnesty granted to the ruffians of Avignon. A far inferior number refused its vote to the decree concerning the colonies.

“And now,” asked the ‘*Mercure*,’ will the King sanction these decrees? Will the sacrifice made during these three years by His Majesty of his prerogatives, which are most essential to liberty, to public safety, to the exercise of monarchical government—will it extend to the ratification of resolutions which will involve in mourning, misery, and despair, millions of citizens living under the safe-guard of constitutional laws? Will then the sovereign’s conscience always be subjected by conjunctures?”*

The answer to these questions was but too evident: the suspensive veto had in fact been just annulled by the selection of that ministry which the Jacobins had imposed upon the King:

“The recent change of ministry has necessarily rendered obsolete the suspensive veto, by surrounding the throne with agents of that faction which dictates the law. That which was foreseen by a few rational minds has come to pass. After having tried every gradation from monarchists to republicans; at length, step by step, the King has consigned himself to the Jacobins—a portion of their council has become his. His Majesty’s note to the Assembly, on the occasion of this renewal of the ministry, and the atrocious

* “*Mercure*,” March, 1792, No. 13.

comments made on it by the watch-dogs of democracy, sufficiently attest the violence done to the monarch's freedom of choice. Moreover, the fact is corroborated by the list of those men to whom the King has confided the guardianship of his interests and the reigns of government. Sundry popular exploits and extravagances constitute the sole title of the upstarts who displace M. de Lessart, a man endowed with practical experience; M. Duport du Tertre, over zealous for the constitution, but a man of integrity, incapable of betraying his duty as a minister; a servant of the King, and a citizen, except through weakness; M. Cahier, more fanatical than even the chancellor, wholly possessed with every popular prejudice of the day; a blind enthusiast, but instinctively just; having habitually been so throughout his life up to the days when revolution inflicted a momentary blemish on the morality of the most honest. This late cabinet is replaced by MM. de Grave, La Coste, and Dumouriez, whom we mentioned last week; subsequently by M. Roland de la Platière and M. Clavière.

"M. Roland, a connection of Brissot, was one of the leading agitators at Lyons, whose inhabitants accuse him as the author of their broils. In his character of inspector of industrial art, he composed the dictionary of manufactures for the *Encyclopædia*. He possesses neither administrative talent, nor experience in state business; but is hot-headed, and imbued with the most exaggerated principles of the times.

"I must be excused offering any remarks on M. Clavière, inappropriately reported to be a Genevese. Born in France of a French father, a stranger for many years to

the country which had adopted both him and his, he was only connected with it by a participation in those agitations which carried it to the verge of the precipice. He is an indefatigable writer; and has inundated France with pamphlets, all indicating talent, acuteness, subtilty, duplicity, the obstinacy of self-love, and a presumption which sickens even fools. He has shown the Constituent Assembly a specimen of his modesty. He may be forgiven his zeal for mobocracy, as he has lived in the midst of republican dissensions; but such is the calibre of his judgment, that he will not hesitate to try upon an empire of twenty-five millions of souls a form of government to which, at Geneva, he could not bring even the popular party to conform.”*

All Mallet's energy and good sense were unavailing: his post became daily less useful, and more dangerous. He keenly felt the disproportion between the force of the revolutionary current, directed by men resolved to carry their point at all costs, and the resistance of a journal, which could only plead reason and justice, at a time when reason excited no influences, save those of anger and impatience, and justice had given way to the sanguinary exigencies of democratic state-craft. “Sheets of paper are no weapons against a storm,” would he frequently say. Moreover, worse situated than any of his confraternity, he had against him the fury of the Jacobins, the resentment of converts of all periods, and the ill-will of the emigrants, irritated by his clear-sighted mistrust, and declared horror of civil war. After threats so often repeated, he could not hope longer to escape the

* “*Mercur*,” March, 1792.

fate denounced against him by the patriots in their journals, and in the street-cries.* From the moment the Republican party in the Legislative Assembly declared war against the House of Austria, Mallet du Pan clearly saw that he could no longer continue to edit the "*Mercure de France*," nor even remain in the kingdom, without daily risk of life and liberty.

* The daughter of Mallet du Pan, accounting for the strength of her opinions by the lively recollection she retained of this period, writes thus to a friend: "Can you conceive what was my childhood, passed amid the early horrors of the revolution? Can you conceive the terrors of those silent evenings when, seated on a little chair beside my mother, every knock at the door sent a thrill through me, because it might announce my father, the expectation of whose return was daily accompanied with the dread of seeing him brought back murdered? Neither my mother nor myself uttered a word; but, child as I was, I divined and shared all her feelings. Then that frightful scene at the Opera, where I heard those *good* people vociferating against the aristocrats, and shouting, '*Mallet du Pan, à la lanterne!*' A sign from my courageous mother checked me; but I suddenly lost all consciousness of the place, and of what was passing around me, and my whispered inquiries excited so much alarm as to render it necessary to remove me from the box. A friend who was with us took me out to breathe the fresh air, while my mother remained motionless. From that day I date many of the complaints from which I have since suffered so severely. And then those dreadful days of the 5th and 6th October, 1789,—that ominous rolling of the drum—those National Guards whom I shall never cease to execrate—those torrents of rain, and my poor father's consternation, which the event, alas! but too fully justified. Then those heads borne aloft on pikes! and later, the flight of the King, during which we saw no resource but to fly from our house, to separate from each other, to conceal ourselves, some in one place, some in another. And those cries of "*The King arrested at Varennes!*" I still hear those cries: they still trouble me from the bottom of my soul."

From the month of April, this fear was exchanged into certainty by the increased denunciations levelled at him in the Assembly, the Jacobin Club, and the public papers. Several members of the Legislative Assembly warned him that his impending arrest, his removal, and his trial at Orleans, were resolved upon by the Republican Committee, and that all the efforts of the right side would not suffice to save him. But, indomitable to the end, he chose once again to declare the truth to the whole world—to the Revolution—alike to friends and foes, beginning with those malcontents, who, on the authority of common-places, always hoped to see the end of public misery without their interfering in the matter.

“Because a remedy was looked for in the very excess of evil, it has been judged superfluous to oppose it; people have settled down in their quiescence; they have laid out a commodious plan of expectation and inaction; above all, they have avoided with the utmost care all connexion with the general movement to slacken its impetuosity. In unconscious obedience to the will of its persecutors, the crowd has preferred hurrying past the frontiers: many of the emigrants had an indisputable right to seek their safety elsewhere; but this measure, which the fearfulness of anarchy imposed on women, aged men, and marked men threatened by popular fury, the love of imitation or a narrow policy soon rendered a general fashionable expedient. Foreign countries received shoals of terrified fugitives, who, once beyond the boundary, regained their former confidence; every morning brought them an impending counter-revolution: they have borne everything—exile, privations, fatigue, ruin, buoyed up by the hope that on the earliest opportunity

foreign powers would set themselves to repossess them of their hearths and titles, or that the people, at length undeceived, would hasten to restore them.

“These illusions were kept up by maxims current in pamphlets and in conversation: disorder results in order, was heard on every side; anarchy will reproduce despotism; Frenchmen will never forego a king; they love kings—no nation was ever more attached to their kings: democracy dies out of itself; it is not suitable for France, and therefore can never be established there—and a thousand other platitudes, pardonable in men who have never come in contact with a popular government; verified it may be in the lapse of half a century, but false when quoted as promising a speedy termination to the republican fever of the French.

“Disorder never resulted in anything but disorder; it is an effect which becomes a cause—and an all-powerful cause when in the hands of a faction without any counterpoise. It is prolonged because its prolongation is necessary to its originators, and through their skill in enlisting the multitude in its favour, it promotes their purpose, which is to enervate and degrade legitimate authority, that they may transfer to other quarters its power of action. Violence paves the way for further violence; laws are enacted only in order to ensure the success of illegal acts; and contempt for these very laws is enjoined by their enactors, the moment they prove an obstacle in the way of their undertakings.

“This anarchy, which may be called systematic, is also compelled by necessity; for the springs which produce and prolong it are essentially destructive of all the means of order and repression. A popular faction, subject to its own

instruments, and enslaved by the multitude it appears to rule, would in vain endeavour to moderate its impetuosity; the reins of government would soon pass into the hands of other leaders, and step by step the necessity for disorder would place at the head of the people, men whose meanness or wickedness would never fail to ensure them impunity.

“The French Revolution has already passed through most of these periods. Each new disorder is founded on that which preceded it, and unavoidably serves as a basis to others: anarchy assumes the character of a power that overrules all legal authorities, and takes advantage of legislation itself to extend its ravages.

“To all these means of duration, anarchy unites the unperceived influence of an artifice which likewise serves to foster a lawless democracy. The power with which it endows its agents, the tyranny which it exercises through its satellites, are a voluntary deposit from the multitude, who fear nothing from an authority which they feel free to recall at any moment. Anarchy applauds those oppressors whom it will denounce so soon as tyranny endangers its well-being; each individual of the community comparing himself with those to whom is confided popular rule, and discovering in them his equals, ceases to fear them—considers the crimes of their despotism as his own birthright, and enjoys the reflection that he in his turn may dispose of lives and persons. It is said that there *was* one citizen of Paris, who, beholding M. de Lessart accused and cast into prison with no more ceremony than is employed in handing over the protest of a bill of exchange, felt some misgivings that such summary justice might reach him as well as a

minister ! No, on the contrary, all recognised an act of their own authority in that of their representatives ; and their vanity was secretly flattered by the idea that to them also appertained, as truly as to M. Brissot, the power of immuring an administrator in a dungeon.

“ In short then, let no man deceive himself. Of all forms of government, the democracy, to a debased nation, is that which most certainly generalises the passions by fomenting them. It fascinates the vanity, and exalts the ambition of the most vulgar minds—opens a thousand doors to cupidity, to the participation of power : it develops in brutes as in the man of intelligence, in garrets as in drawing-rooms, that love of domination which constitutes the true instinct of man—for he loves independence only as a means of authority, and once delivered from tyranny his first desire is to exercise it.

“ Until our time, republican dissensions having been almost exclusively confined to the class of proprietors, the circle of popular ambition did not reach the classes who by their pursuits, their poverty and their ignorance, are naturally shut out from the administration ; but now it is upon these very classes, excited by the combination of an immense number of perverse men connected with the people, that has devolved the formation, the empire, the government of the new political system. From the château of Versailles and the anti-chamber of the courtiers, the supreme authority has passed without any counterbalancing power into the hands of the *prolétaires* and their flatterers.

“ A profusion of appointments, elections of functionaries, continued agencies have excited the thirst for command, and

extended the self-conceit and influenced the hopes of the most incapable men ; an absurd and wild presumption has delivered, the foolish and the ignorant from the sentiment of their nothingness ; they have supposed themselves capable of anything, because the law accorded the exercise of public functions to capacity alone. Each has been able to picture to himself a prospective of ambition : the soldier has no longer any care but to displace the officer ; the officer to become a general ; clerks to supplant the administrator in chief ; the lawyer of yesterday to invest himself in the ermine, the curé to become a bishop ; and the most frivolous scribbler to sit upon the legislative bench. The places and appointments rendered vacant by the promotion of so many *parvenus*, have in their time offered a wide career to the inferior classes. The lowest office has presented a dignity, the most scanty remuneration a fortune, to individuals who in a well regulated democracy would never have presumed to aspire either to office or emolument.

“ Thus, step by step a general disorganization has been effected ; thus France has been converted into a card-table, upon which with babbling, audacity, and a frenzied brain, the ambitious of the lowest capacity have thrown their dice.

“ Let us now estimate the impulse which the national character will lend to this immense lottery of fortune, of advancement without merit, of success without talent, of endless offices distributed by the people as a whole to the people individually. Let us examine the incalculable activity of such a mechanism working in the midst of a nation, where the mania of making a figure dominates over all

other passions ; where the love of disputation, of wrangling and of sophistry has destroyed all rational intercourse ; where the shopkeeper round the corner is more proud of his epaulette than the great Condé was of his *bâton* ; where gravity, reflection, reserve, and that moderation of spirit which can alone assuage the delirium of a bad democracy, are found only among the small number of the silent and retired.

“ It is, therefore, from an utter want of observation and judgment that so many inattentive or sanguine men, coming out of their box at the Opera or mounting the step of the carriage which is to conduct them to Coblenz, have for these three years adjourned the end of the storm to the quarter. It is absurd to suppose that a great monarchy of fourteen centuries can be destroyed in eight days, and recover itself again by the progress of anarchy or inconstancy of the multitude.

“ But, indeed, the seeds of disorder do not lie so near the surface. Those who have planted them, know the human heart and the spirit of the age better than their adversaries. While the discontented reposed on the illusion of the monarchical sentiment, of the re-action of opinion, of the experience of excesses, the lessons of misfortune, the Jacobins, but little alarmed at these chimeras, extended their conquests from day to day.

“ They alone have formed a faction during any length of time, the other parties either dragged on an inert existence or formed mere cabals. Whoever seceded from them to dispute their authority, ended after some ephemeral advantages by falling back again into their orbit or by being ruined. Thus, they deprived MM. de La Fayette,

Barnave, Duport, Lameth, and a hundred others less important of their popularity; thus, after some weeks of strife they subdued the Assembly. Replacing the defections by new recruits, if public opinion appeared to withdraw its favours from them, they opposed bold laws to it. If they are trammelled by the constitution instead of following it, they explain away the difficulty by availing themselves of popular prejudices. Always active, always enterprizing, they successively avail themselves of threats, promises, and punishments, always calculating upon their pusillanimity, giving over to the mob and to shame whoever dares to doubt, leading minds with a heap of words: ever in extremes in order to stir up the public lukewarmness, they alone displayed consistency, an unvarying plan, an uniform system.

“The establishment of the clubs subjected the whole of France to them. It was necessary to choose between the dominion of these and that of the constitution. The Jacobins have not hesitated; the constitution has been sacrificed: twelve hundred associations, corresponding with one common centre, have renewed the ascendancy of the Jesuits; they have placed themselves above the law, and have made laws to legitimate their infractions.

“What resistance has been offered to this confederation? Was it weakened by the daily increase of a host of grumblers? Far otherwise. While it tightened the bonds of union, and became consolidated by success, its adversaries were scattered hither and thither, without compass, without leaders, without plan, without vigour or principle of harmony. Little intimidated by this discordant crowd,

the Jacobins marched impetuously towards their object, repeating with Narcissus :

“ ‘ J’ai cent fois, dans le cours de ma gloire passé,
Tenté leur patience, et ne l’ai pas lassée.’ ”

All surprise ceases, when we see the large landed proprietors, the aristocracy, the majority of those who, from their position, their ancient descent, their fortune and their connections, still retained some influence, fly across the frontiers, and abandon the kingdom to the faction which was overthrowing it ; when it was seen that the King, deprived of all power, was reduced to the constant extremity of succumbing or of perishing ; when it was seen that pernicious counsels induced the fugitives to place their reliance exclusively upon the assistance of foreigners ; to solicit this aid with a clamour as futile as imprudent ; to consume time, efforts, and money, in the vain expectation of its being granted ; to assure themselves of it with a confidence always deceived,* and to remain powerless by these demonstrations, to furnish the Jacobins with fresh pretexts, and new instruments of domination.

“ All surprise ceases on recalling to mind that system, as deplorable as it was erroneous, by which they congratulated themselves on the increase of the disorders and the

* “ It has been calculated that if the troops, Austrian, Russian, Sardinian, Swedish, Russian, Swiss, Imperial, Dutch, which were to have marched in the ‘ Journal Général ’ of the Abbé de Fontenay, had arrived at their destination, France would have been attacked at that moment by nine millions one hundred and four thousand anti-revolutionary soldiers.”

victories of the republicans, as being a preparation for a more rapid reaction.

“All surprise ceases on looking back to those disgraceful dissensions which divided those who had lost all, and those who had all to lose, when, invested on every side by an enemy, master of the breaches made in monarchical government, in property, public and social order, general security, and in the principles which protected all interests, it is seen that the different proprietary classes of society diverted themselves with their reciprocal disasters ; when having been a witness to their hatred, their debates, and their conflicts of political opinions. While France hurried on towards its dissolution, while the Republic established itself, the disconected disputed about the best possible form of government—whether there should be two chambers or three — about the administration of government under Charlemagne and under Philippe le Bel—on what it was necessary to relinquish or retain of the innovations of the three last months.

“As if the owners of a house in flames, instead of flying to the pumps and uniting their forces, were to dispute about the design for the reconstruction of the edifice ! When it was not possible to defend that which was destroyed, they should not have wasted their efforts in attempting to collect all the fragments of the wreck, nor have preferred remaining in the street, because they were not lodged exactly as they were before the catastrophe.

“A thousand questions, idle, insolvable, or unimportant, afforded daily food for animosity. It is impossible to censure sufficiently some of the *émigrés*, and those culpable writers who foment this discord, who foster all the germs

of schism among the adversaries of the republicans, among the sincere friends of the King and the monarchy. What senseless advisers then persuaded the royalist refugees that it was possible to save France from total disorganization by their own power and their own opinions? When you, the weaker party—when all your measures are ineffective or uncertain; when you are imperiously pressed by a decidedly preponderating faction—can there be conduct more miserable than that of the intolerance of party, of repulsing, outraging, and threatening with your vengeance those who offer their support without adopting all your opinions than that of declaring an unrelenting war against whoever does not adapt himself to the strict line of your opinions—and to reserve our moderation for your enemies.*

“How! without distinction of character or motives, shall whoever may have erred during the course of the revolution, whoever has been undeceived by experience, while retaining such political opinions as he believes to be conformable to reason and to public interest—shall such a man be reprobated because he will not sacrifice the noble love of moderate liberty to the party which his co-operation would assist in raising on its ruins?

“If this really is so, it is necessary to draw a veil over France; for—I say it openly—I do not perceive any prospect of salvation, except in the coalition of opponents uniting

* “In the distribution of power mapped out by some sanguine fugitives, and the publication of which we owe to the writers, M. de La Fayette is found side by side with Jourdan, M. de Casalès on the same level with M. de Talleyrand, M. Malouet beneath M. Robespierre. It has been printed, repeated, and written over and over again, that I am more hurtful than Gorsas, Carra, or Brissot.”

themselves to demand the cessation of anarchy, the suppression of its actual causes, and the restoration of general order. I say that all those who have this aim should postpone their enmities, their political disputes, and their pretensions; that they should, above all, remember this truth, that they are unworthy of defending anything laudable, who do not know how to make a sacrifice; and that when in sight of the gulf upon which we are thrown, it is the height of madness to enter pertinaciously into the defence of those questions which divide us, instead of strengthening ourselves on those points on which all are agreed.*”

It was by these counsels, and by preparing to follow them himself, that, towards the close of the month of April, 1792, Mallet du Pan took leave of the readers of the “*Mercure*,” after eight years of assiduous labour. But, in laying down the pen of the journalist, which he was not to resume, until approaching the close of his career, he did not enter into the repose of private life—he did no more than change his task and his devotion. It is to an account of the new efforts of this martyr to rational politics, and to modern liberty, that the remaining portion of this work will be devoted.

* “*Mercure de France*,” April 7, 1792, No. 14.

CHAPTER XII.

1792.

Louis XVI. entrusts to Mallet du Pan a political mission to the Emperor and the King of Prussia—Nature of the instructions given by the King to his agent—Departure of Mallet for Geneva, and thence for Frankfort—Coblentz—M. de Montlosier, and the Chevalier de Panat—The Princes are dissatisfied with the mission of Mallet—Occurrences of the 20th June—Letters of Malouet and the Abbé de Pradt—Conferences at Frankfort—Note from Louis XVI.—Opposition of the Russian minister, M. de Romanzoff—Tardy success of Mallet with the ministers of Russia and Austria—The manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick—Error of Bertrand de Moleville in his “Memoirs.”

So soon as Mallet du Pan had determined upon quitting at once the “*Mercure*” and the kingdom, M. de Montmorin, M. Bertrand de Moleville, as well as Louis XVI., were apprized of the fact by Malouet, who, while approving of his friend’s decision, had imagined that he could render him serviceable to the King, and to the public cause. In the first instance, an outcry was raised against his departure, which would leave the field open to all the poisoners of opinion, but the necessity was very soon recognized, and Louis XVI. made known to Mallet

that he relied upon his attachment for the execution of a mission as delicate as it was important :

“In an opening conference,” Mallet relates, in an unpublished note, “M. de Bertrand informed me that His Majesty, having again spoken to him of my departure, he approved of it, and was desirous that I should proceed to Berlin and Vienna, and, lastly, to Coblentz to represent to the Princes, his brothers, to the Emperor, and to the King of Prussia, the situation of the kingdom, as well as the intentions of the King with respect to the war, and its consequences.

“Upon an observation which I made to M. de Bertrand, that the future Emperor would arrive at Frankfort in June, to receive there the imperial crown, and that the King of Prussia would join that monarch on his way to the army ; the journey to Vienna and Berlin was considered superfluous, and that to Frankfort preferable in all respects.

“His Majesty, having adopted this alteration, commissioned M. de Bertrand to request me to draw the sketch of a manifesto for publication by the powers, in the spirit, and with reference to the great object, of reconciling that which ensured the safety of the King, the moral and political state of the kingdom, and the true interests of the monarchy. I submitted to His Majesty some general heads of this composition ; he had the goodness to praise it, to suggest some others in the margin with his own hand, and to entrust to me the preparation of a final draft, which was preserved by M. de Bertrand, like other daily notes from the King, in a St. Augustin in the King's library.

“This last draft, having been inspected by the King, and having received his approbation, he added a summary of general instructions, containing the fundamental points of my commission, which was revised by M. de Montmorin, and of which I took a copy.”

What were these instructions—what were the considerations which, adopted or suggested by the King, had served as their basis? The instructions are known: since M. Bertrand de Moleville published them in his *Memoirs*, the various historians of the revolution have reproduced the text, and pronounced their respective judgments upon them, but always with that attention which this important document merited. The question was, whether Louis XVI. invited the foreign armies into France; what in his soul and conscience, he expected from their Assembly; and, lastly, what were his sincere intentions with regard to the political constitution of the country? The articles of instructions do not settle all these questions clearly. The memorial written by Mallet and corrected by the King, is more explicit; that memorial has never been published in France* any more than the other documents emanating from the association. These documents deserve to be made known, for they appertain to history; they prove that Mallet du Pan in accepting the mission which was entrusted

* Professor Smythe, of Cambridge, gave this document ten years ago, in his course of lectures (*Lectures on Modern History—French Revolution*). This memoir had been communicated to him by his friend M. Mallet, son of our author, who settled in England since the death of his father, and who during forty years filled the post of Secretary to the Audit Office.

to him, was not the simple bearer of a message from the King, but that he went to Frankfort to express desires conformable with his own principles, and his firmly established desires. That independent man would not have been chosen as the negociator of measures, contrary to his own opinions, who was known to have exerted all his energies against the royalists, who invoked war as a final settlement.

Louis XVI. had, in fact, tried by every means to ward off this disaster from his unfortunate kingdom; it was not he who armed the foreign powers, it was the Assembly itself that declared war against the Emperor. At the end of April, the revolutionary troops suddenly crossed the frontiers, and entered the Low Countries, where they had just received a sufficiently severe check at Mons and Tournai; everything foretold that the allies would have an easy victory. In this state of affairs the King, in addressing himself to the allied sovereigns, could not but interpose, and in fact he did interpose, between their armies and his own kingdom. He entreated them to distinguish between the nation and the factions who oppressed their King, in contempt of the constitution itself. Assuredly, his idea was not, that having become free in his own person, and arbitrator between the allied powers and his former subjects, the revolution should be respected with all its conquests over royalty; that would have been to perpetuate the anarchy from which it was just and necessary to deliver France. The natural effect of the invasion for which the foreign powers prepared themselves, as well as the desire of the King and the force of circumstances could have

decided it, was a counter-revolution. A counter-revolution ! unfortunate and formidable term, which sufficed to ensure the condemnation of the King in the eyes of fanaticism and revolutionary folly ; a term which signified to them nothing less than the overthrow of the existing revolution, a design still more legitimate than that of Mirabeau, who a year before was desirous of overthrowing the work of the Constituent Assembly. Undoubtedly, for one part of the royalist *émigrés*, a counter-revolution was but a return to the ancient régime ; as for d'Eprémesnil and his parliamentary party, it was the institution of the legislative and political power of the ancient parliaments ; but for the King, who reserved to himself the initiative, and from dignity as much as from decorum had not spoken in his instructions of a counter-revolution, it was precisely a counter-constitution, as Alex. Lameth had called the counter-revolutionary plan proposed to the King by Mirabeau. Such was the sincere idea of the Prince, and it is proved by the selection of Mallet du Pan by the King himself, at the instigation of Malouet. Neither Malouet nor his friend, made any secret of their profound conviction of the necessity of giving to France a constitutional government. " There can be no stability in an absolute government which succeeds an actual revolution," wrote Malouet to Mallet du Pan. As for the latter, his language with respect to this point never altered, and we shall see directly what declarations he considered himself authorized to propose to the foreign kings and to the foreign princes. In this, to speak the truth, consist the interest and the novelty of the facts which we are about to add to those

which are to be found in the “*Mémoires tirés des papiers d'un homme d'Etat*,” in which may be read a faithful, but brief account of the mission of Mallet du Pan.*

The first part of the instructions given by the King to his envoy refers to the Princes and *émigrés*, and is couched in these terms :

“The King joins his entreaties to his exhortations, to induce the Princes and the French *émigrés* not to deprive the war by any coalition hostile and offensive on their part, of the character of a war made by one power against another.

“He expressly recommends them to entrust to him, and to the intermediate courts, the discussion of the preservation of their interests, when the time shall arrive for considering them.

“He desires that they should appear merely as partners, not as arbitrators in the difference ; that arbitration should be reserved to His Majesty, when liberty as well as the royal power shall be restored to him.

“Any other conduct will produce a civil war in the interior, will endanger the life of the King and his family, may overthrow the throne ; will be the destruction of the royalists, will rally round the Jacobins all the revolutionary parties which are now detached from them, and which are separating themselves every day ; will reanimate an excitement which promises to subside, and render more obstinate a resistance which will bend before the first decisive success, when the fate of the revolution does not appear to be

* The account of Bertrand de Molleville is at least incorrect, as will soon be seen.

entrusted to those against whom it has been directed, and who have been its victims.”

Afterwards come the suggestions which the envoy of Louis XVI was charged to address to the courts of Vienna and Berlin.

“To represent the utility of a manifesto on the part of the courts of Vienna and Berlin, which might be common to them and the other powers which have formed the concert; the importance of constructing that manifesto in such a way, as to separate the Jacobins and the functions of all classes from the rest of the nation; to secure all who are susceptible of recovering from their delusion all those who, without desiring the actual constitution, fear the return of great abuses, all those whom the violence of passions, the contagion of example, and the first intoxication of the revolution have engaged in that criminal act, but who, not having to reproach themselves with anything more than errors of excitement or of weakness, would be disarmed the moment that a prospect presented itself to them of an honourable and safe issue.

“To insist upon the advantage of introducing into the manifesto, the fundamental truth, that it is not intended to touch the integrity of the kingdom, and that the fear of a dismemberment is an unworthy artifice, by which the usurpers seek to convey a false impression of the true and only aim of the powers; that war is made against an anti-social faction, and not against the French nation; that the defence of legitimate government against the fearful anarchy which threatens the tranquillity of Europe, insulting to all sovereigns, preparing the most horrible calamities for all classes

without distinction, tearing asunder the ties of society, of laws, rights, duties and customs, under the shelter of which repose peace, true liberty, and public safety within and without.

“Neither to impose nor propose any system of government ; but to declare that they have taken arms for the re-establishment of the monarchy and the legitimate royal authority, such as His Majesty himself might think fit to prescribe.

“To declare again and emphatically to the National Assembly, to the administrative bodies, to the ministers, municipalities and individuals, that they will be considered responsible in their persons and property for all outrages committed against the person of the King, against that of the Queen, and of their family, and against the lives and property of all citizens whatever.

“That in entering the kingdom, the powers should show that they are ready to conclude terms of peace ; but that they cannot and will not treat with any but the King. That, in consequence, they require that he should have the most perfect liberty, and be replaced in any position he may choose where he might consider that he should be most assured of its exercise, and that afterwards a general plan of restoration should be determined on, under the auspices of the powers, by a definitive negotiation between them and His Majesty—a negotiation in which the grievances of the Princes and *émigrés* should be recognized at least, if they should not prefer entrusting their interests to His Majesty.”

With these instructions thus extended and minute, there still remained a difficulty, caused by the exigency of affairs

and the care which was imperative for the personal safety of the King.

“ Credentials were indispensable to me,” says Mallet, continuing his account, “ the more so as Germany had been inundated with secret agents, or pretended emissaries, professing to be ministers of the will of the King, the Queen, and the French Princes in turn. This multitude of commissioners, their indiscretion, and their mutual opposition had justly tended to make any such advances discredited. But I could not without the most glaring imprudence carry with me a written authority from His Majesty, through the hundred leagues of country to be traversed before leaving France. The post was no longer safe ; transmission by hand would have rendered communications indispensable which it was important to avoid. M. de Montmorin thought of making the authority of His Majesty come from M. le Comte de Mercy-Argenteau, from whom I should receive it at Brussels ; but the correspondence with that ambassador having become precarious since the commencement of hostilities, it was decided by the confidential advisers of the King, that M. le Chevalier de Bertrand, brother of the minister, should join me at Cologne, on his way to England ; that he should bring to me there ulterior instructions and the credentials which would ensure my recognition by the two sovereigns at Frankfort, by their ministers, and the Princes, brothers of His Majesty.

“ I was ordered to keep my mission an inviolable secret, and not to disclose it to any one unless necessity demanded it, except the two monarchs, the Princes, His Majesty’s

brothers, to the Maréchal de Castries, and to M. de Bouillé. I was, moreover, directed to consult M. de Castries, already instructed of the intentions of His Majesty, who placed a well-founded confidence in him. In honouring me with his own, His Majesty deigned to declare to me that he expected from my zeal a success of which he fully appreciated the importance—that I seemed to him more capable than anyone else of fulfilling that hope—and that he considered me especially qualified to demonstrate the wisdom and necessity of his plans, as well as the character of the conjunctures which called for their execution.

“It was, in fact, a very delicate negotiation, to present such important interests in their true light, and to advocate a system of combined direction between the King and the two belligerent powers; a system upon which depended the fate of their Majesties, of France, and even of Europe itself. After having made known the insufficiency of my capabilities of surmounting the opposition which I foresaw, and the obstacles with which this course was encompassed by the lapse of time, by the crossing of so many previous envoys who had wearied the courts with their contradictions, and by the decisions which might have been already come to by the cabinets, I no longer dreamt of anything but of overcoming the immense weight of these difficulties. In a conversation of several hours which I had with M. de Montmorin at his house, the evening before my departure, and in the presence of M. Malouet, I begged that minister to communicate to me what he knew of the dispositions of the allied powers. He answered my questions with candour and precision: he showed me despatches and

official reports which justified his opinions ; he did not conceal from me any of the embarrassments which I should have to encounter, whether in the previous views which the cabinets had manifested, or in those which had been suggested to them, or in the line of conduct which was observed at Coblenz. The fears and arguments of M. de Montmorin were like so many prophecies ; the result proved their justice.—The fundamental object to which we directed our attention, and which was that of the private views and instructions of His Majesty, was the especial importance of making the war retain the character of a foreign war of one power against another, in order to dispel any idea of a collusion between the King and the two courts, and to bring the termination to the form of an arbitration between His Majesty and the foreign powers on the one side, and on the other between His Majesty and the nation. This last conference with M. de Montmorin took place on the same day that that minister and M. de Bertrand entered a criminal information before the judge of the peace La Rivière, against Carra and his calumnious denunciations of an Austrian committee sitting in the Tuileries.

“I carried away with me from the house of the minister a presentiment of the fate which threatened him, and deep anxiety for the future.

“On the 21st of May, 1792, I left Paris. At this time the police regulations as to passports were very troublesome ; nevertheless, I arrived at Geneva on the following Sunday. The impossibility of leaving the kingdom by the German frontier without increasing my personal risk had determined my route : I appeared less suspicious by returning

to my own country, whence the transit to Frankfort was easy."

Mallet du Pan, having arrived at Geneva on the 22nd of May, hastened to write to the Maréchal de Castries, to inform him of his mission, and to prepare the way for his ulterior proceedings; for the Chevalier Bertrand de Moleville having been taken ill on the eve of his departure for England, had not been able to convey to Cologne and Frankfort the documents which were to have accredited Mallet to the French Princes and the foreign sovereigns.

LETTER OF MALLET DU PAN TO THE MARÉCHAL DE
CASTRIES.

"Sir,

"Having arrived here the day before yesterday, I prepare to leave it in the early part of the following week, to present myself with all convenient speed to you, in order to consult you upon the execution of a mission of importance and secrecy, relative to which I have received instructions from His Majesty. He has desired that I should do myself the honour of conferring with you upon it; thus merely forestalling my own wishes and intentions. Prudential considerations, which were demanded by the actual situation of the kingdom, and the horrible tyranny under which it groans, have separated me from a person who will probably arrive at Cologne before me, and who is charged to present you with my credentials. I was personally too much watched and menaced, to run the risk of travelling through a hundred leagues of France, with any documents of importance.

"I desire, Sir, far more than I dare hope, to fulfil effica-

ciously the enlightened views of His Majesty. Your advice and your assistance will, perhaps, compensate for my deficiencies. I am not the first to pursue the same course: many have miscarried, or been but imperfectly successful; but none will have carried into this affair a zeal more free from any spirit of party, of system, or of interest. No one is more convinced of the justness of His Majesty's opinions, who having agents in all the departments, who daily receiving the most reliable and multifarious information, knows with certainty the disposition of the public, and what is to be feared or hoped, according to the nature of the forms, or the means by which the exterior force is seconded. The safety of the monarchy, of the King, of his family, of property, life—the stability of future order which ought to succeed to the actual overthrow, the necessity of mitigating the crisis, and of weakening resistance—all concur in soliciting the attention and the acquiescence of true royalists to the views of His Majesty.

“He fears, with reason, that the foreign war will induce a civil war in the interior, or rather a jacquerie. This is the object of his most anxious solicitude. He is ardently desirous that, in order to prevent the incalculable horrors, the possibility of which is too thoughtlessly rejected, the *émigrés* should not take any active and offensive part in the hostilities; but should consult the interests of the King and the state, of their property, of all those royalists remaining in the kingdom, before obeying the impulses of honour and of a too legitimate resentment; finally, that after having disarmed crime by victory, and dissolved a frantic league of usurpers, upstarts from nothing, by reducing them to incapacity of resistance it might be possible

by this salutary change to open the way to a treaty of peace, in which the foreign powers and His Majesty would be arbitrators of the fate of our laws, and of that of the nation.

“These, Sir, are essentially the intentions and the desires of His Majesty. You will have been long acquainted with them: I here do no more than recal them to your mind. The present emergencies do not permit wisdom to neglect the most serious examination of them. If I may presume to quote my own experience, and what I believe I know of the situation of affairs and individuals, I shall not be embarrassed, except in the choice of the proofs which give grounds for His Majesty’s representations. All would go well at the present, and in the future, if the plan which he recommends be adopted—all will be involved in peril, uncertainty, and difficulty, if it be discarded.

“It is to you, Sir, alone that I make this preliminary communication. It will probably be transmitted to you before my arrival by my companion in travel, who having crossed the channel, will proceed from England to Ostend, and thence to the town where you reside.

“Receive, etc., etc.”

At last Mallet du Pan was able to commence his journey. He arrived at Frankfort on the 12th of June. The Diet had not yet assembled, and the ceremony of the convocation would not take place until the middle of the following month. Neither the Emperor nor the King of Prussia being expected before that time, Mallet considered it his duty to execute that part of his instructions which con-

cerned Coblenz. The Maréchal de Castries had entered into communication with him from Cologne, where he resided, and had led him to hope that the intentions of the King would not meet with any obstacles on the part of the Princes. He appointed a meeting. Mallet's instructions imposed upon him the strictest secrecy, and ordered him not to compromise his mission by appearing in places where he would be too much noticed; for conjecture, interpreting the motives of his journey, would not fail to send its comments to the capital, thus exposing the King to fresh suspicions, and closing the gates of Paris upon him. Therefore, on approaching the head quarters of the *émigrés*, his only object was to ensure the receipt by Monsieur and the Comte d'Artois, of the communications which were destined for them. He wrote a respectful letter to the Princes in addressing the memoir to them. The part of this latter document, relating to the Princes and the *émigrés*, contained very delicate observations upon the conduct which the King expected from their attachment, and an urgent recommendation not to add the flame of civil to that of foreign war. A representation was made to them, of the dangers and the misfortunes which would be incurred by their overt participation in the invasion of the allied powers.

"His Majesty," thus runs the memoir, "never entertained a doubt of the unanimous resolution, on their part, to confide to him the care of the interests compromised, or that the Princes considered themselves as injured parties in a difference, the arbitration of which should be exercised by His Majesty, when the fate of war should have restored the liberty necessary to the exercise of the royal power."

Undoubtedly the Princes and the nobles were actuated by a too justifiable resentment, to avenge three years of outrage and to attack those cruel usurpers ; undoubtedly it was a moment in which civil war would not have been other, on the part of the oppressed, than an exercise of the right to repulse force by force. The public and individual calamities would, perhaps, have been less protracted without being less terrible. But the foreign war, to the declaration of which Providence had inspired the factious, is now destined to effect, with less peril, misfortune and uncertainty, that which could only be hoped for from civil war.

“Let us preserve France from the united infliction of these two calamities. They would extend, in the most terrible manner, over three hundred thousand families dispersed throughout a frantic people ; they would endanger the life of the King, and those of the Queen and the royal family ; would overthrow the throne ; give up property to pillage ; be the destruction of the royalists and of those priests who, remaining within the kingdom, maintain a threatened existence ; they would reanimate an excitement nearly extinguished ; they would rally round the Jacobins the less furious revolutionists, and would render more obstinate a resistance which will now bend before the first decisive success, when an intermediate body is seen between the armed emigrants and that portion of the nation which is to be subdued.

“The human heart does not change. We dread those who have been cruelly outraged : there is no hope of pardon from those towards whom no mercy has been shown. The people are incapable of elevation to the sentiment of a generosity which they do not feel.

“Consequently, the different factions which have thrown the kingdom into disorder, dread to encounter, in the Princes and the *émigrés*, enemies from whom they can expect no consideration. They look upon them only as surrounded by chains, executioners, punishments, and instruments of oppression.

“This prejudice has been incessantly fomented by the revolutionary libelers, by the declaimers at the tribune, by the efforts of the assemblies and the clubs, and, it must be said, by the levity of language of several young and ardent persons, the impolitic and always threatening virulence of some royalist writers, who talked only of the gallows; and finally, the silence and forbearance which the Princes have considered due to their dignity, in the midst of renewed imputations and the proscriptions of the Assembly, have exasperated and rooted this prejudice. It is easy to perceive from this, what will be the consequences in case the *émigrés*, united in a body, should direct offensive operations against the frontiers of the kingdom

“Fury, resistance, thirst for blood, would be excited against them; all other points would be left undefended; France would be abandoned to foreigners, in order to close it against the *émigrés*: if they did not murder the prisoners, there is no kind of violence of which they would not become the victims. The first news of an engagement between the royalists and the troops of the Assembly, would be the pretext for fresh crimes and the signal for butchery, in all places where the clubs dominate over the administrative authorities.”

We shall see how this language was received at Coblenz.

It was at Frankfort, in the midst of the *fêtes* of the

coronation, that Mallet had to await the explanations of their Highnesses. But they made known to him through M. de Castries, that, notwithstanding the importance of secrecy, they were desirous of seeing him without delay, and invited him to proceed to Coblenz under the name of M. Fournier, linen-draper. This first appointment was prevented by some mistake, and afterwards renewed : Mallet, therefore, made several journeys from Frankfort to Coblenz.

“The Princes, without openly showing it, were ill satisfied with the part assigned to them by their brother ; still more discontented with the engagements entered into by the King in the proposals of the manifesto which Mallet submitted to them, but allowed their feeling to be seen as little as possible by the agent whose hand and tendencies they recognized in the instructions. He was not long in discovering that the *émigrés* were divided into three parties ; the partizans of Calonne, the anti-Calonnists, and the monarchists : the former, to whom was attached the Prince of Condé, wished for the unfettered restoration of the old *régime*. He also learnt, through the Maréchal de Castries, that the Courts of Vienna, Berlin and Petersburg, would hear no more of Calonne, whose advice no longer prevailed in the council ; and that he had M. de Vaudreuil on his side, and all the others against him—MM. de Castries, Jaucourt, Bouillé, de Broglie, &c. Nevertheless, his influence over the Comte d’Artois was such, that his advice might be rejected without its being superseded by others. It appeared evident to him, therefore, that the great obstacle to an advance towards a settlement, was the opposition between the views entertained at Coblenz and at the

Tuileries, each having their emissaries at the courts, who mutually opposed each other.

The Maréchal did not tell him all; it was through Montlosier and the Chevalier de Panat, both his most devoted friends, that Mallet knew what to think of the disposition of the parties at Coblenz. Montlosier recommended him to adopt a dignified severity. "They respect," said he, "without liking you much, and you may be certain of making a great impression upon them. I pity you sincerely for all the trouble you have had. Continue, however, to prosecute this ungrateful task, and I do not doubt you will arrive at a favourable termination; we shall be indebted to you for it, and our gratitude will be your principal reward." He requested Mallet to see the Duke of Brunswick, and conciliate him; "For," said he, "it cannot be doubted, that if your mission is not received favourably, the Princes will very effectually avail themselves of the services of that General to injure your cause with the King of Prussia and the Emperor."

"The inconsistencies of the Cabinet at Coblenz do not surprise me, my dear friend," writes the Chevalier, in his turn; "but I am grieved that you should have made a fruitless journey, and lost the time which you owe to far greater interests. Yesterday, I dined with the Comte de Vaudreuil; he approached me with as much curiosity as interest. . . . After some few words, we had the following conversation:—'What do you think of M. de Bertrand?' 'I think that he has energy and talent.' 'And his opinions?' 'He is a true royalist.' 'But the King?' 'Malouet has taken possession of him, and we fear his influence.' 'Malouet lives retired, and is not connected

with any party ; he thinks of leaving Paris.' 'We have recently received from the King a communication which grieves us,' added the Comte de Vaudreuil ; 'I did not evince my desire to become acquainted with it, but it appeared to me that the object of your mission was not regarded favourably.' The Comte de Vaudreuil turned the conversation to the 'Mercure ;' and from that to you the transition was very easy. He spoke to me of you with a tone of esteem ; told me that you were at Frankfort, and that he was far from attributing to you the opinions proscribed by the pure royalists. He assured me that the Duke of Brunswick had said to the Prince, that the *émigrés* would be splendidly employed, and that he sets this price on his services. He talked much of the Baron de Breteuil, whom the foreign Courts did not much esteem, although he had the confidence of the Cabinet at the Tuileries ; and he concluded by saying to me, that M. de Castries, the mediator between the two parties, and less odious than the Baron de Breteuil, would certainly be placed at the head of the Ministry. I relate to you this conversation, because M. de Vaudreuil, being the friend of Calonne, and having the entire confidence of the Comte d'Artois, it might determine your opinions as to the hopes and fears of the Cabinet at Coblenz. It is known that we supped together at Bonn, at the house of Cazalès ! It has been interpreted, and made matter of scandal, like everything else ; but all that is of no consequence."

M. de Montlosier, who sometimes reappears in these *Mémoires*, became thenceforward one of the most striking characters of the *émigrés*. He shared with Cazalès the

contempt of the Court of Coblenz. "They and Foucault," says Mallet du Pan, in his notes, "are left in the most profound neglect; the former has been refused a place as major of artillery. Cazalès is reckoned hare-brained, and has given offence by his frankness. Montlosier, a professed monarchist, attacked right and left on occasion; and his last book had alienated the Comte d'Artois. When Mallet found him at Coblenz, he was busily occupied with his work, and from time to time left the camp of the *émigrés*, to run over the libraries of the country, and search for the documents of which he had need; sometimes at Mayence, sometimes on the Rhine, sometimes in the woods with his companions in misery and exile: he swore against Calonne and the revolutionists; read, admired, and related the whole to Mallet, in the letters which will shortly be given.

In the midst of these events, and while the Assembly at Frankfort, looked for with impatience, was still further delayed, the Revolution made alarming progress at Paris. The letters received by Mallet from the Abbé de Pradt and Malouet, which were full of terrible accounts, disturbed the sentiment of hope which he had for an instant entertained.

A letter, from an unknown hand, reached Mallet towards the middle of June, apprizing him that the royal family were threatened with immediate danger. "Since your absence," wrote this unknown correspondent, "affairs have taken a turn which renders honest people apprehensive as to the fate of the royal family: they know not to what results the events and the great excitement of popular fanaticism may lead: external arrangements assume no definite character, and the certainty of impunity induces

the factious to venture anything, because they can carry out everything. Consider what I have told you as true and positive." It was Malouet, who, as the intermediate correspondent between his friend and the King or his counsellors, conveyed this information to Mallet.

The occurrences of the 20th of June, the invasion of the Tuileries by sixty thousand *sans-culottes*; the crowning of the King with the *bonnet rouge* by the populace; all the characters of that horrible scene only too well justified these presentiments. The day after this took place, the Abbé de Pradt, who called Mallet du Pan his master, and was one of his most assiduous correspondents, wrote to him thus :

LETTER FROM THE ABBÉ DE PRADT TO MALLET DU PAN.

" Paris, June 21st, 1792.

" We have passed a day, my dear friend, still more horrible than that of October 5th, and which neither tears nor blood will ever be able to expiate or to lament sufficiently. Paris has filled the measure of its crimes. Your council at Coblenz should at last learn what kind of war and control it is that we require and you—give up all idea of your chambers, your assemblies, your tribunes, your arrangements. The sword, *morbleu!* the sword.

" The *émute* had been announced for several days. The appearance of the two vetos furnished the pretext. The evening before, one hundred and fifty deputies and as many Jacobins had dined at a great banquet in the Champs-Élysées, and distributed wine and food. All was encou-

raged by the Assembly to such a point, that they thought of sending Dumas to the Abbaye, who had asserted that the nation had debased itself by the outrages which it had permitted to be offered to its chief. All was so arranged that the people said, now was the time to make an end of it; but we received no injury, no violence, and the most frigid calmness was contrasted with the most shameful licence: at last a man was thrown from the windows of the palace, for having attempted to steal a watch."

Malouet, an eye-witness of the scenes of the 20th, wrote some days afterwards:

LETTER OF MALOUE TO MALLET DU PAN.

"June, 1792.

"You will have read in all the papers the atrocious scenes of which we have been witnesses; the courage, the calmness of the King, and the devotion of some faithful servants, have saved his life and that of the Queen, but could not prevent the more sanguinary outrages, repeated during three hours. . . . Since that time the notices of the republicans have been atrocious, and their party is sufficiently strong for them to find enough support everywhere—in all the assemblies, in the National Guard itself, which contains a number of Jacobins, the Feuillants, the Constitutionals, the discontented of all classes, are on the defensive: the spirit of the Assembly is always the same. Pétion defies all those whom he threatens, and holds the department in check, which does not yet denounce him nominally. The scene of Monday the 25th inst., was as

audacious on the part of the factious as was possible : they even came to the bar of the Assembly, and said ‘You seek the authors of the proceedings on the 20th : we are they ; here we are,’ and they received the honours of the House. Meanwhile everything is ready to defend the Tuileries, a little better than on the 20th ; I have been there, and seen the Dauphin in the uniform of the National Guard : he was insulted. ‘It is to deceive you,’ said an officer of the battalion of the Croix Rouge, ‘that they have put our dress on that boy.’ The cannons which were in the court-yard of the Tuileries, were also surmounted with the *bonnet rouge*. You will see by this what is the spirit of a great part of the citizens besides the *sans-culottes*. The members of the Right in the Assembly are treated as in the former—like scoundrels, traitors, aristocrats. They cannot speak without being hissed. Jaucourt narrowly escaped being assassinated.

“What is to be inferred from all this ? Not only that there is still such a revolutionary spirit among the factious, but in the mass of the people as well, that those who are not Republicans prefer to join the latter, rather than all others whom they think slightly attached to the constitution. What further must be inferred ? That those men who excite themselves to madness by enterprises which are denounced as contrary to their anarchical liberty, will not be amenable to any other restriction than that of a permanent force. Now I ask you where is this to be found—where it can be—how long it will last ?

“Remember that in speaking thus, it is to you and not to the belligerent powers that I speak : it is to your better judgment that I answer.”

Some days afterwards, Malouet continues his information to Mallet du Pan regarding the King's actual position.

June 29th.—"The state of public affairs continues threatening: the Jacobins and the Republican section, which are the same thing, behave with a continually increasing audacity. The appearance of M. de La Fayette at the bar of the Assembly took place yesterday in the midst of murmurs and applause. He came to defend his letter, and to demand in the name of his army the punishment of the partakers in the outrages of the 20th, and the dissolution of the Jacobins. Guadet and his party attacked him, and accused him of having quitted the army: they had to put it to the vote to know whether they should summon the minister to declare that he had given the General leave of absence. A majority of a hundred rejected the motion of Guadet, but nothing was decided as to the petition, and the Jacobins met that night as usual; the sections were also assembled, and the Pétions always dominate there. It was the same with the addresses approving and disapproving of the transaction of the 20th: abuse of the King and Queen overbalances the disapprovals.

"A French guard of the section of the 'Minimes' said, that he pledged himself to kill the King if he did not support the decrees: the President wished to make him withdraw, he was opposed by the faction, and was himself obliged to withdraw. The arrangements for bringing a large number of federates here on the 14th of July, were executed in spite of the refusal of a sanction.

"The Assembly wish to go from here and to take away the King. There is no doubt that they intrigue everywhere to bring about the nomination of a National

Convention: they rely upon the south provinces. If M. de La Fayette, after having taken the decisive step, were to do no more, they would still have gained ground. I can see the people are persuaded that England will support the Republican party. The minister Morris* said to me yesterday: 'If it is not true, it is at least likely.' It seems that M. de La Fayette is ready to march with his army upon Paris. The King is calm, resigned to all; he wrote on the 19th to his confessor: 'Come to me Sir; I never had so much need of your consolations: I have done with men—it is towards Heaven that my thoughts are turned. Great misfortunes are announced for to-morrow: I shall have courage.' The journals of Brissot and Condorcet are more ferocious than ever. Adieu, my friend."

In a letter of the 7th July, Malouet recapitulates the previous acts of the King, and affirms that they emanated from his individual will.

"It was the King's conscience, his opinion, his individual will, which made him resist the decree of transportation levelled against the clergy and the camp of twenty thousand men: it was this resistance which occasioned the change of ministry, and it was this change which set the Jacobins in motion: such are the causes and their effects. Now, an unequivocal constitutional opposition has declared itself against the Republicans; twenty departments and a far larger number of municipalities support La Fayette's demands, and the epoch of the federation will confront the two parties. Jacobin and anti-Jacobin National Guards arrive from every quarter.

* Governor Morris, minister of the United States at Paris.

In this general agitation, the King appears calm. It was designed to drag him to the federation: he announced that he would attend it. What will be the issue of this fearful crisis, alas! I know not; but it appears to me proved, that the policy of the Jacobins is to crush all intermediate parties, and to show themselves as the only national power, to the end that they alone may treat with the foreign potentates. Farewell: you are very happy in being at Frankfort; stay there as long as you can."

Malouet, though subject to benevolent delusions, could not for an instant be duped by that revolutionary sensibility which, in full National Assembly, at the affecting voice of Lamourette, hurried the Jacobins and the Feuillants into each other's arms.

"Despite all the emotions it has excited, the scene of reconciliation between the Feuillants and the Jacobins is a paltry mockery, which has left just where they were all the intrigues and enmities. An equal dose of fear in all the parties concerned, gave rise to this farce; and from to-day all resume their true character. The department is insulted and denounced for having interdicted Pétion: the Jacobins and their satellites cry out in the streets and the Assembly, that they will have Pétion or death. The King's deportment towards the Assembly, though applauded at the moment, could not shield him afterwards from the usual outrages: matters continue very much as before."

While Malouet wrote to Frankfort in these terms of alarm, his friend had achieved his mission. The Emperor had been elected on July 2nd and crowned on the 13th, the day of the anniversary of the French Revolution.

Mallet, a witness of the ceremony, had not waited for this moment to execute the King's orders. Informed by letters which reached him, his impatience approached to agony ; but the difficulties of diplomacy, the minutiae of decorum, did not allow him to escape from any one of those delays so dear at the time to cabinet politicians.

The most serious opposition he experienced proceeded from the Comte de Romanzoff, who endeavoured to estrange him from the allied sovereigns and their ministers. Having perceived that, at Frankfort, he seemed to be listened to only out of regard to the Maréchal de Castries, the King, at his entreaty, sent him a letter in his own hand which triumphed over all mistrust,* and assured to the negociator the credit of which he had need, in order to be listened to. At last he was officially presented to the Emperor, the King of Prussia, and the Duke of Brunswick, as being charged to communicate to them the intentions and the views of the King. The King of Prussia asked a great many questions about the state of France and the royal family. But the principal affair was treated of only by the ministers of the two Powers ; M. de Cobentzel for Austria, and M. de Haugwitz for Prussia. General Heymann, newly-appointed *attaché* to M. de Bouillé, an officer in the Prussian service, and frequently employed in diplomatic affairs, took part in these interviews. After various preliminary interviews, in which an exposition of

* This letter, the *fac-simile* of which may be found in the " Histoire de la Révolution," by M. Bertrand de Moleville (t. VIII, p. 452) was thus couched : " The person who presents this letter knows my intentions : what he says may be relied upon." The original is in the possession of M. Louis Mallet, Mallet du Pan's son.

the objects of the mission was presented, together with the memoir explanatory of the instructions, the conferences took place on the 15th and 18th of July. The papers of Mallet du Pan present us with a brief account of these conferences, and, although written in haste and in the form of memoranda, we shall not venture to substitute for them a more developed narrative :

“ Conferences, on the 15th, with Heymann; the evening with the Comte de Haugwitz, who, having twice read my memorial, sent it off the next day by a courier to Anspach and the King of Prussia, with a letter.

“ Conference, the 16th, at the house of M. de Cobentzel, with that minister, MM. de Haugwitz and Heymann. Great questioning, and explanations required as to my credentials. I presented the King's letter; Heymann certified it. I gave an account of the first steps I had taken. Every confidence was placed in me, when the conformity of my views with those previously manifested by the King to the two Courts was seen. Interrogation as to Coblenz and the intentions of the King, with regard to the *émigrés* : I explained them. Details as to the interior, as to the balance of opinions in the kingdom. M. de Cobentzel spoke principally. He evinced a great indisposition towards Coblenz. He asked me where were their arms, their magazines, their artillery : he did not know for what or how they were to employ them. M. de Haugwitz announced that the plan of Berlin was in accordance, in all respects, with that which I proposed; it would form the emigrants into an army, to be transferred to the King on his restoration to liberty.

“ They asked me if the great majority of the kingdom

were decidedly opposed to the old form of government: I answered in the affirmative.

“ M. de Cobentzel complained that the Emperor, having offered to take into his pay the regiments of Saxe-Berchiny, Royal-Allemand, and other corps of the line, commanded by French officers, he had been refused.

“ Again asked what I thought of the views of the Princes.—Answered, that I had no doubt that the Princes and the majority of their advisers were not animated by laudable intentions; but that it was not so with all.—On being asked to give my views of M. de Calonne, of whom unfavourable mention was made, I confirmed that opinion.

“ ‘ The intentions of the King,’ said M. de Cobentzel, ‘ are very different from those of the Princes, who want to do everything, create a regent, and act independently.’ I answered, that such a course would be attended with the inconveniences and misfortunes which I had exposed.—The answer I received was: ‘ *The confederate powers view the matter in the same way as you.*’

“ They declared to me that they intended to conform in everything to the intentions and desires of the King, and requested me to provide them with a note or summary of these for the next day; promising that, where they accord with those of the powers, they will be scrupulously carried out.

“ They assured me positively that no views of ambition, personal interest or dismemberment entered into the objects of the war. As a proof of this, they assure me that instead of imposing a government, they will allow the King to be absolutely his own master and to arrange that with his subjects.

“ I left at the end of three hours. Heymann remained : he was instructed to express to me their entire satisfaction, and that they placed full and entire confidence in me ; that I was the only one who had talked reasonably, and they invited me not to maintain silence in any respect as to Coblenz. M. de Heymann informed me of this the same evening, and invited me to a conference on the next day.

“ Third conference, the 17th, at the house of M. de Haugwitz. I delivered a summary : it was completely approved of, and considered conformable with the views of the confederate powers.

“ Questions as to the force of the nobility, as to the number of them who had emigrated, and of those who remained in the kingdom. They expressed to me the impropriety of establishing them as a political body ; they were to be reinstated in their property and titles, but not in their feudal power.

“ M. de Cobentzel took pencil notes of my principal observations and questions, during the first and second conference.

“ Fresh official and positive declaration of the complete disinterestedness of the allied courts.

“ They said to me, that there would be no peace in France and the neighbouring countries so long as it was given up to anarchy, since this necessitates cordons, expenses, extraordinary precautionary measures.

“ General conversation upon different details relative to the King and the country. I was asked for the particulars of the affair of the 20th of June : I gave them. M. de Haugwitz shed tears. They take minutes to lay before the two Sovereigns.

“ Fresh assurances of satisfaction and confidence. Requests not to take my departure until after the conference at Mayence. Carried my *précis* and project for a declaration to the Princes to M. de Haugwitz on the 18th; the Emperor leaves on the morning of the 19th.”

Mallet du Pan requested that Prussia and Austria should without delay, and before their armies entered the French territories, issue a manifesto of which he drew up a programme in accordance with his instructions. That declaration should in the first place convince the French people, that the revolutionary leaders had deceived them by assuring them that neither the Germanic body, nor those of the north or south would espouse the present quarrel—that, on the contrary, the allied powers were resolved not to sheathe the sword until the King was at liberty and his authority legitimately re-established. The manifesto should with the same object declare energetically to the National Assembly, to the capital, to the administrative body, &c., that they would render themselves personally liable and responsible in person and property for the slightest injury to their Majesties, their family, and all citizens. But in order to impress fear with confidence, they should at the same time declare, that they had taken up arms against the faction, not against the King and the nation; that they undertook the defence of the legitimate government of the people against a ferocious anarchy, which menaced the tranquillity of all Europe, prepared the most horrible calamities, and reversed all the ties of men and society. Thus, factions would be deprived of their great argument, that this is a *war of kings against nations*. In order to strengthen the confidence made by this distinc-

tion between the factious and the rest of the nation, care must be taken not to propose any form of government, and to declare that they took up arms only to re-establish the monarchy, the liberty of the monarch and the restoration of his authority.

“This measure,” remarked Mallet du Pan, “would soften the majority of the revolutionists, wearied out or wavering, who, without wishing for the actual constitution, feared the return of great abuses, of vengeance, and oppression, and who knew that his Majesty would be their most certain protector against danger, and from whom submission might be expected, the moment the possibility of it was offered to them without disgrace or personal danger.”

Mallet then insisted, in the name of the King, upon the imperative necessity of hastening the publication of the manifesto. “All those who surround his Majesty,” said he, “all who judge rationally of the movements at Paris, are unanimous in their desire for the acceleration of this important measure;” and he supported the urgency of his appeal with reasons derived from the informations which his correspondents had communicated to him.

“The war,” said he, “is at this moment forgotten at Paris, and in the provinces it troubles no one, intimidates no one, any more than the battles of the English in Hindostan. In vain do the gazettes announce the march of the foreign troops—a hundred popular libels reassure the Parisians each day. The absolute silence of the allied powers since the hostile declaration of the Assembly, the defensive war in Brabant, unimportant reverses, affronts that make no impression, the necessarily slow formation

of the armies, the ruin, the distress, and the dissension in which they see the *émigrés* remain—all has concurred to prolong, to increase the stupefaction; the perceptions of the most timid are bounded by the idea that, before daring to engage in warfare, the allies will propose to them an accommodation which they deride in the same way that they despise the danger incurred by their frontiers.

“ It is to these various sources of security, that the progress of the authority of the Jacobins must be attributed, as well as their last enterprizes and the terrible outrage of the 20th June. Time has been afforded them to concoct fresh catastrophes, which the least delay will enable them to put into execution.

“ It should not be mistaken that, if that frightful event of the 20th June, a scene unheard of even among the armies of the Revolution, in which their Majesties were submitted to outrage, exposed to perils, which horrify the imagination of that day of sorrow and opprobrium, has not been terminated by two regicides, it must be ascribed to one circumstance alone. Their Majesties were saved only by one of those popular impressions, which the skill of the demagogues could not prevent. They were incapable of influencing that infamous populace against the ascendancy of the royal majesty, the presence of its sovereigns, the involuntary fear which enchained their regicidal arms at the voice of those august personages, whose heroic firmness disarmed those sanguinary and debased beings.

“ Since that time the same perils continue suspended over the heads of their Majesties; and it is only by dint of artifices and precarious means that they still defend their lives. From one day to another, France and the whole of

Europe may be plunged into mourning. Their Majesties count the moments until the publication of your manifesto : their life is a hideous agony."

On the 10th of July, (eight days before the close of the conferences), the Princes received from the agent of the King, their brother, another draft of the manifesto, in which, as Frenchmen and the chief citizens of the state, they represented to their country the state of demoralization, of misery and anarchy into which it had fallen. After having completed this picture, drawn with an energetic eloquence, the French Princes continued, in the name of their companions in exile, addressing to the French nation the noble conclusion :

"And yet the factious accuse the French *émigrés* of arming themselves against their own country ! Against their country ! Rather against the sanguinary associations, against the societies of brigands which have subdued unfortunate France ! She is in the possession of a few scoundrels supported by a corrupted populace, who have assumed the name of the people. She would become the prey of those exclusively who rend and ruin her to consummate her overthrow by the complete establishment of a Republican government.

"This power is founded on that of might : such is the liberty they have bestowed on the nation ! After having themselves exercised this terrible right through three tragical years, they have endowed all Frenchmen with it ; and when once the social bond is broken, undoubtedly every citizen regains his independence, and would be authorized in reclaiming at the sword's point, those rights of which he was violently deprived.

“ But leaving these theories to brigands, who reciprocally protect each other in Paris, the expatriated French who have not opposed even their outrages, their natural and legitimate defence, do not now take up arms for the purpose of securing their personal interest.

“ In uniting themselves to call for a termination to the series of calamities under which the kingdom is bowed down, they do not separate themselves from that large part of the nation at present unconnected with the illusions of anarchy. They unite themselves with all good Frenchmen, to deliver the King and the people from a league of usurpers. They demand from the factious the restitution of the monarch and the monarchy, the liberty of the head of the state, and *laws protecting the rights of all*. They demand a termination of the disorder into which all branches of the public administration have been plunged; the security of the Princes, squandered by mismanagement and corruption; a permanent and regular order which will close the abyss in which the factious have swallowed up three thousand millions of capital; the re-establishment of the security of the public creditor, credit having been destroyed, and the nation's resources delivered over to speculators, and the most scandalous prodigality.

“ As the first citizens of the state, they will afford to all others an example of submission to the desires of his Majesty. To the crown, restored to its authority, they will confidently entrust the care of their interests. Those of the state are too dear and too sacred for them not to concur with the voice of the King re-established in his legitimate authority, with all which wisdom prescribes to

him for restoring existence to the monarchy and tranquillity to the people.

“ In these sentiments, which long-continued outrage has been unable to weaken, the French Princes and *émigrés* do not deign to repel those base calumnies, by which it has been attempted to alarm the people as to their disposition towards the kingdom.

“ How could the French people have doubted? Have we ever dreamt of confounding the nation with the seducers who have drawn it into error? Are we ignorant to whose hands we owe the injuries which we pardon, in consideration of the intoxication of a people carried away by the fascinations of artifice and perversity?

“ The factious have recompensed our first sacrifices by ingratitude and oppression. We offered the hand of help to all those who were not accessory to the enormities of the revolution, to all those who, renouncing their hatred and those fatal opinions, unite with us in consoling his Majesty for his long sufferings, and to render him the homage of their obedience and fidelity.”

That such language should have been adopted by the Princes was what Mallet undoubtedly never expected: they who hitherto had obstinately refused to enter into any explanation with the French people, persuaded that the dignity of silence was the sole protest which was becoming to their dignity and their rights; how had they sacrificed their repugnance at the time when, full of hope and illusions, they already saw the revolution subdued and chastised by the avenging armies of the northern powers? The restoration which was meditated in the councils of

Coblentz was not that announced in the manifesto in the name of the King.

From that quarter, the agent of Louis XVI. did not look for any aid, except from the amicable views of the allied powers;* and it was upon this that he relied for giving to the invasion that character which the situation of the King demanded, and to the *émigrés* the only position which became them, if they were desirous of not subjecting their country to the calamity of a civil war.

Everything agreed in convincing him that his reliance had not been misplaced. The views of the Memoir were fallen in with, and applauded, and a salutary distrust of Coblentz was manifested, from whence might proceed oppositions or suggestions equally dangerous. Confirmed in his hopes by the confidence and the esteem which the ministers testified for him, Mallet considered his mission terminated, and therefore, he purposed, in accordance with his instructions, to return to Geneva, as the troops collected on the frontiers were preparing to pass it, with the Duke of Brunswick at their head, preceded by the promised manifesto.

On the 19th of July, the Emperor left Frankfort to join the King of Prussia, at Mayence, that he might come to an understanding with him in a final conference, which took place on the 21st. Two days afterwards, Mallet took his departure, and on the 25th appeared the famous manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick.

That manifesto was not what Mallet had a right to

* During the stay of the Princes at Mayence and Frankfort, Mallet wrote to them several times, requesting an audience. All his letters were unanswered.

expect after the implied premises which had been made to him; it certainly contained some few of the points which he had suggested, but it was difficult to do more than its writers had done to strip it of the only character which would give it any force.

The manifesto proposed, according to the King's views, would have dexterously inspired at once a salutary fear and confidence. After having drawn a circle round the factious, he did not fear frankly to retain the political interest, and the legitimate desires of the nation; in short, though very energetic, the tone was not haughty, the national pride was carefully worked upon; and perhaps that combination of vigour, freedom, and political reason would at least have struck the sensibility and the imagination of the French people by its novelty. On the contrary, what effect could be produced by the cold, constrained, and yet offensive language of the celebrated declaration which bore the signature of the Duke of Brunswick?

How was it that the conferences should have terminated in such a meagre result? It was because the meanness of the Court of Coblenz, supported by the Pussian minister, had been beforehand with the envoy of Louis XVI, whose ascendancy they feared. While M. de Romanzoff, as we have already said, discredited Mallet du Pan with the allied sovereigns and their ministers, and endeavoured to discourage him by the assurance that he would not be granted a conference, that no measures would be taken without the Princes, and that his mission was futile, the manifesto was printed. The Marquis de Limon, at first a partizan of the revolution, and at this time an extreme royalist, put forward by M. de Calonne,

offered to the ministers to undertake the preparation of a manifesto. The offer was accepted, and the *émigré* commenced his labours. His draft was, in the first instance, submitted to the Emperor himself, who approved of it, and afterwards showed it to the King of Prussia, during their interview at Mayence. The King gave his support to it; but the Duke of Brunswick, without daring to confess that the proposed draft was unsatisfactory to him, requested to introduce alterations with the consent of the ministers and their Majesties. In a conference with the Comte de Lascey, M. de Cobentzel, Baron Spielmann, and Comte Schulenbourg and the Councillor Rengner on the part of the King of Prussia, the mitigated views of the Duke of Brunswick were adopted; the most severe passages were softened down, without, however, removing altogether that which appeared to him to be impolitic in that solemn declaration.* The original constructor strongly disapproved of the alterations, and declared that the manifesto so mutilated would make no impression.† “To believe some persons then in the Duke of Brunswick’s suite,” say the ‘*Mémoires d’un homme d’état*,’ “it was not till after signing that the phrase was introduced by which the Duke threatened, in case of violence to the King of France, to take an exemplary and ever-memorable

* “*Mémoires tirés des papiers d’un homme d’état*,” t. i. p. 406 and 409.

† “At a later period,” it is said in the “*Mémoires d’un homme d’état*,” M. de Limon demanded satisfaction for his labours. But the King of Prussia, being no longer of his opinion, sent him word that it was the business of those who had given him orders for the preparation of the manifesto to reward him

vengeance on Paris, by giving over the capital to military execution and utter subversion. The Duke, taking the copy then presented to him with this interpolation, is reputed to have torn it with indignation, although he did not dare disavow it."

Such are the true facts connected with the origin of the too famous manifesto: the account in the "*Mémoires d'un homme d'état*," drawn from original sources, leaves no doubt on this point of history. It considerably modifies the accounts given from recollection by Bertrand de Moleville, in his "*Mémoires*;" a curious but very trifling work, which the emigrant minister composed in London, during a time of necessity, for a publisher, who paid him seven hundred pounds for it. M. de Moleville stated that the Duke of Brunswick, after having adopted the manifesto proposed by Mallet du Pan, subjected it at the last moment to essential alterations. As soon as Mallet was apprized that M. de Moleville was preparing his "*Mémoires*," he charged his son, who was in London, to request the author not to publish anything respecting the mission with which he was honoured by Louis XVI., before communicating with him. M. de Bertrand read his account to Mallet's son, and promised to wait for the remarks of his father. The latter wrote immediately to M. de Moleville to correct his errors, especially that which referred to the Duke of Brunswick, and to demand its suppression. On the arrival of this letter, the "*Mémoires*" had been already distributed throughout the town; the author had proceeded in his course, without making any delay. The Duke of Brunswick was extremely indignant at the utterly false allegation respect-

ing himself, and he demanded of Mallet du Pan its correction, for the use of the German editor, who was about to publish a translation of the "*Mémoires.*" The following is the letter, which was addressed to Mallet du Pan by his friend, the Chevalier de Gallatin :

LETTER OF THE DUKE OF BRUNSWICK.

" Sir,

" The '*Mémoires* of M. Bertrand de Moleville,' written in English, are about to be translated into German. I have met with a passage in them which concerns myself, in reference to which it is necessary that the public should be undeceived. I here subjoin the passage in question, translated into French ; and I entreat you to communicate with M. Mallet du Pan, that he may say in a few lines, signed with his name, and couched in a manner that I may have it inserted as a note in the German translation, that which at the first glance he will see to be untrue, respecting a conference between him and myself, as well as the discussions in which I am said to have assisted in the construction of a manifesto, which he had given, and which I have never seen, being ignorant even of its existence until this moment. Pardon me for the trouble which I cause you ; but I may be allowed to endeavour to avoid being handed down to posterity as a thoughtless crackbrain.

" I have the honour to be, &c.

" CHARLES, Duke of Brunswick."

This declaration is explicit ; that of Mallet is not less

so. In replying to the Prince, he commences by relating to him his fruitless efforts with M. de Moleville.

"Your Serene Highness," he continues, "will do me the justice to believe, that, in speaking of circumstances so serious to the Minister of the King of France, I was incapable of dictating falsehoods like those published by M. de Bertrand, and of compromising such a name as yours, Sir, by allegations so impertinent. Unfortunately, your Serene Highness was not one of the council of the coalition, and it was with that council alone that I transacted any business. M. de Bertrand has made use of his reminiscences without examination, and has related the public rumours which overran Europe, instead of copying my despatches.

"His conduct in this publication is not less surprising than reprehensible; but the surprise of your Serene Highness will be diminished, on learning that the Minister of Louis XVI. had no other intention in view in publishing his strange disclosures and revelations of all kinds, than an interested speculation. He has compiled these volumes without reflection and without selection, confusing without judgment the true and the false, and he has written the '*Mémoires*' not for history, but for the publisher, to whom he has dearly sold his rhapsody.

"I am ashamed, Sir, to occupy you with such miserable details; but, in laying them before you, I am anxious to justify myself from any collusion with M. de Bertrand, and the assertions which he attributes to me. The profound respect which I owe to your Serene Highness and to truth, fills me with chagrin on reading that statement :

and I cannot forbear to tell what I did to enlighten the author, before his romance saw the light.”*

Moreover, it was too late for a manifesto to produce the effect which had been anticipated. The energetic prosecution of the military invasion, prompt successes, a rapid

* Mallet writes in the following terms to the German translator of the “Mémoires of M. Bertrand de Moleville:” “I have received, Monsieur, a portion of the Memoirs published in English, by M. Bertrand de Moleville, at London, in which the late minister of Louis XVI, gives an account of a commission with which this unfortunate monarch honoured me, in the middle of 1792.

“Since you are about to endow Germany with this work, I owe it to historical truth, to my own honour, to the character and august rank of H. S. H. the reigning Duke of Brunswick—I will even add, to the intentions of M. Bertrand de Moleville—to undeceive the public regarding a grave error which escaped that minister.

“In speaking of the conferences accorded me by certain ministers of H. M., the Emperor and King, and of H. M., the King of Prussia, he gives it to be understood that H. S. H., the Duke of Brunswick was present at these conferences; that I consulted him as to the nature of the manifesto demanded by his most Christian Majesty, and that this Prince, *after having adopted it, altered it considerably*, at the opening of the campaign.

“Not one of these assertions is accurate. H. S. H., the Duke of Brunswick was with the army, and the conferences of which M. Bertrand speaks, took place at Frankfort-on-the-Maine. His Serene Highness was invariably absent. The views that I was appointed to set forth on the subject of the manifesto, were to be judged of, adopted, or rejected by the councils of the two belligerent Courts, and by them alone; consequently, it was to them alone that I addressed myself. If the Duke of Brunswick was acquainted with them, it was not through any communication or consultation on my part: it is then evident that he could not *alter* what was unknown to him, far less had he approved or adopted it previously.

“Have the goodness, Sir, to oppose my testimony and my former

march, could alone effect that crisis of public opinion of which there was need. Such as it was, the threatening document which the Duke of Brunswick consented to sign did not make any impression on the already wearied imagination of the Parisian public. It has been said that the effect of the manifesto was that of adding fuel to fire, and that it stirred up public opinion. The revolutionary leaders dexterously availed themselves of this indiscreet declaration to excite the clubs, and the people through the clubs, and for them it was just what they desired, a pretext for the last *coups*, which were already preconcerted. But letters of that time testify that the first impression was nothing; that scarcely any notice was taken of this proclamation, which had been prejudged, and which fell so far short of expectation.

On the 4th of August, after the publication of the manifesto in the royalist journals of Paris, a man of great penetration wrote to Mallet :

“The declaration of the Duke of Brunswick makes no sensation : it is laughed at. It is not known except to the journalists, and those who read the papers. It may even be said, that if it is not followed up by proceedings corresponding to its promises, it will only tend to aggravate the evil, to exasperate hatred, and give fresh force to the dominant party.

“I have talked over it with men in office. They shrugged disavowal to the credit which Mr. Bertrand’s error may acquire. He is informed of it ; he will himself rectify it in a fresh edition. No man has exceeded this minister in activity, zeal, and devotion in the service of Louis XVI. ; but the disorders of the times, and the space which divides us, probably prevented his consulting me and avoiding the mistake into which he has fallen.”

their shoulders : no one officially recognizes the declaration, and the threats which it contains do not disturb the progress of intrigues of constitutional or Jacobinical proceedings, any more than a passage in the 'Mercure,' or the 'Gazette de Paris.' Security is great without, however, the means of its defence being neglected. I do not know on what this may depend. Perhaps the intentions of the Courts are thought to be only denunciatory ? Perhaps the intervention of England is relied upon ? Perhaps—and indeed that is most probable—they reckon on the very considerable forces which the revolution commands, and which becomes more fully organized every day in a military point of view."

A short time afterwards, he received a letter from another correspondent, who confirmed these remarks :

"The declaration has not produced any kind of sensation : the people do not know of it, and another class of the public, looking for a manifesto in regular form, doubted its authenticity at first : on learning afterwards that it was authentic, the impression was effaced by the real danger of the King at Paris. On the other hand, as only twenty thousand men appear ; as the Austrians desert ; as they have decreed a pension of one hundred livres to every foreign soldier who shall enter France, and as the people come from all the departments, no one dreads the coalition, nor its troops."

However this may be, the campaign was commenced, and the operations of the commander-in-chief fully corresponded to the hesitation which had so long presided over the preparations made by the allied powers.*

* "The misfortune of the Duke of Brunswick consisted in his listening too much to the emigrants. He shared their illusions : and

The unfortunate Louis XVI, as was foreseen, fell the first victim to the false measures of the coalition. The 10th of August realized all the alarms which had instigated the mission of Mallet du Pan, and rendered its results useless. Mallet heard of these occurrences at Geneva, where he was disconsolately awaiting the courier, who had not arrived. That letter of M. Bertrand de Moleville did not reach him until a month after his departure, and he never received the order which Louis XVI. had sent for him to return immediately to Frankfort. His reflections were bitter; and yet if that melancholy event of the 10th of August, and

the unexpected resistance he encountered, surprised him to the extent of intimidating and disconcerting him. The following anecdote will prove this. At the cannonade of Valmy, on the 20th September, the Duke of Brunswick perceived the French cavalry on foot, and their unbridled horses still eating hay. He turned to his companions, and said: 'See, gentlemen, what troops we have to deal with—waiting coolly for us to be upon them before they mount and charge us.' This notion made him slacken his operations. Well! it has since been ascertained, and Dumouriez confirmed the fact at Brussels, that this same cavalry had formally and obstinately resisted him on the order to mount, and that it had determined on yielding to the Prussians.

"The Baron de Salis assures me that, when it was heard at Trèves, at the moment of raising the camp, that Sierck had been taken and some shots fired on the allies, from the windows, the Duke was disconcerted, and spoke to him with the greatest uneasiness of these shots. M. de Salis told him that it would be enough to punish the shooters and raze the houses; but he would not seldom meet with incidents of the kind, and that an example would set all right. The Duke, astonished, could not recover from his surprise, hesitated to make an example, and was in utter perplexity. He had fancied he should reach Paris without firing a shot." *Mallet du Pan's Memoranda*

the situation of the King, had not entirely absorbed his thoughts, he would have been able to breathe his native air with some satisfaction, in recalling to mind the words of approval which the King had expressed to him,* and the esteem shown him at Frankfort. That, moreover, was his only recompense: "As it was neither just nor seemly," says Bertrand de Moleville in his "*Mémoires*," "that Mallet de Pan should make so expensive a journey at his own cost, the King authorised me to give him a sum of two thousand crowns, which he had the honesty to consider too much, and which he only accepted on condition of rendering an accurate account, and of returning the excess when his mission ended."†

In the meanwhile, the letters of the Abbé de Pradt represented to him the state of Paris and the situation of the King, in colours which still further increased his anxiety. Montlosier, equally ardent as the Abbé, wrote from his quarters letters in a less melancholy style, and in his lively original manner.

LETTERS FROM M. DE MONTLOSIER TO MALLET DU PAN.

"August, Trèves, 1792.

"I write to you, my dear friend, as best I may, in the thick of a wood in which we have encamped eight days. We are in the open air, without hay or oats for our horses, without tents or any kind of provision for ourselves. It is not a camp of soldiers or of gentlemen that you would see

* "He is quite satisfied with you," wrote Malouet to him, "quite satisfied."

† Bertrand de Moleville, "*Mémoires particuliers sur la révolution française*."—Paris, 1823, t. 1, p. 394.

here, but a horde of Tartars or Bedouins about to rob caravans in the desert. Such, on my honour, is what we resemble. It is amusing to see how we cut down the trees of the forest. Unfortunately, we had not sufficient hatchets at first; but after a short time we procured some, and fires are kept up day and night. The view is superb; but we have no shelter and are destitute of everything, even the commonest utensils—neither plates, dishes, kettles, forks or glasses—nothing, in short, and nothing can be bought even; for the Prussians keep everything, monopolize everything, and the work-people of Trèves have no time to attend to us. From time to time they send us something, then promise us; which, by making us remit the care which we should otherwise have taken to get provisions, reduces us to extreme penury. I told you what I feared, from the communications of one of the first engineers: what he had predicted is but too fully realized. Our approaching departure was announced day after day: it will not take place till Friday, perhaps later. The Prussians threaten at the present time Thionville and Longwy, which they have summoned to surrender. It is confidently stated, that Luckner has announced to the town of Metz that it has no means of defence. The zealous here are impatient at seeing the Prussians beforehand with them. But what disquiets me most, and entirely absorbs my attention, is the situation of the King. Never has it been so critical, and, unfortunately, I have lost the channel of my ordinary intelligence since I rejoined my comrades. At Trèves I had the news every day, for there is a reading-room there, as well as at Frankfort. Here there is nothing but rain to wet you through, cold and hunger for me and

my horses. All our infantry left yesterday to take possession of the camp which the Prussians have quitted. Probably they will be in the same distress there as we are : but, at least, they will have tents : we have nothing but the leaves of the trees. On the whole, our situation here, midway in a wood, these horses, these fires, this rivulet, this meadow in the valley, all this living picture is exceedingly poetical ; but, in truth, it is neither military nor agreeable, and those among us who have seen war are the most scandalized. For all that, we are in good spirits, and there are scarcely any sick among us. . . .

“All these details are nothing ; the grand crisis approaches, and perhaps at this moment the last hour of this sad tragedy has arrived. We are in great anxiety as to the situation of the King—*we* are—that is to say *myself* ; for on the whole, levity, indifference, and improvisence, are here the general characteristics. If we could come to any settlement, we would take good care to avoid another revolution, which, in truth, is as difficult to get rid of as to endure. . . . I am exerting myself to send you an account of the towns in my province, and of all the reasonable men on whom the government may rely at the moment of a counter-revolution. I will make an accurate enumeration of all the towns, great and small ; for I confess I have an idea for the consideration of which I think every other should be postponed : it is, that the Jacobins have organized the nation admirably. They have displayed marvellous art, to which history will have to devote its attention. Well ! order must be organized in the same manner as they have organized anarchy : the viper must be caught, and then crushed in the wounded

part. Adieu, my dear friend : I will send you my statistics when they are ready. My remembrances to all of yours.

“ P.S.—We have just heard of the last events in Paris. We are in the greatest possible consternation. It seems that the King still lives ! May God protect him : if we lose him, all is lost ! The Princes have received an express from the King of Prussia, whom they went to join. They came back yesterday. We set off to-morrow.”

“Luxembourg.

“ Longwy, as you know, was taken three days ago. Calonne sets off. Breteuil, as they say, has seen the King, and is to be minister. It is the general report. The King of Prussia will neither see Calonne nor treat with him. Monsieur suddenly left the Comte d'Artois in order to join the King of Prussia. He passed rapidly, in the first instance, by Longwy : the people cried, ‘Vive le roi ! vivent les princes.’ But, at his return, they went on before him and rang the bells—even the municipality and a constitutionalist priest, to whom he listened coldly. Amid the acclamations of all classes of people, Monsieur, turning towards the Austrian and Prussian generals who surrounded him, said : ‘See, gentlemen, what the French people is when left to itself.’ The French officers who passed afterwards, as well there as in the French villages, were excellently received. Some persons closed their shops or made off ; but, in general, great goodwill was displayed. Adieu, my dear friend ; I have not been able to put the finishing stroke to that you wot of. I am told that M. Malouet and M. de Bertrand are alive and safe : that gives me great

pleasure. Marshal de Castries, with whom I dined yesterday, is in good health. All about him are much dissatisfied with the manifesto. The Marshal excuses it somewhat: the speeches of Monsieur reconcile him to it. Adieu once more, my dear friend. Receive my best wishes."

Were not the defence of the Tuileries known at the present day in its minutest details, we might subjoin to these letters the circumstantial accounts which Mallet received from two Swiss officers, who were in command at the most exposed posts. From these various sources of information, Mallet du Pan gathered the materials of his "*Lettre sur les événements de Paris au 10 août*," which is not in his best style. No comments can be otherwise than infinitely below the simple narrative of such a day; the most vehement indignation can only appear cold and powerless beside the facts. This narrative had been asked of him by the government of Berne. The honoured leader of the Bernese councils, de Steiguer, had written to him on the subject, as follows:

LETTER FROM M. DE STEIGUER TO MALLET DU PAN.

"Sir,

"I am not yet cool enough to speak to you of the atrocious scenes of the 10th August and the following days. They must fill with indignation every honest heart, but they will produce a yet stronger feeling in Switzerland.

"An authentic and well-digested account of what happened in reference to the Swiss guards, would, in these circumstances, be indescribably interesting to us and to all

Switzerland. False and calumnious statements, already circulated plentifully among the public, and unworthy fellow-countrymen, seem to second these with their pens and their ministry. We must oppose truth to them, Sir, and exhibit it in a manner which will be felt, and produce an effect on the people.

“No one, Sir, in all possible respects, is better calculated to do this than yourself; and I am instructed, in the name of our secret council, urgently to request you to undertake this work, which must be presented to all Europe. You, Sir, have surer means than any one else for procuring the information necessary for such a work. The more wretches seek to disguise truth, the more imperative is it to make it known.

“M. du Bergier is about to depart. I have only time to assure you that nothing can exceed the sentiments of high esteem, &c.

“STEIGUER, avoyer.”

CHAPTER XIII.

1792—1793.

Return to Geneva—General Montesquiou invades Savoy—Preparation for defence—The allied cantons send troops—Clavière—Generous conduct of Montesquiou—Mallet du Pan retires to Lausanne—Baron d'Erlach—Letter of Count Joseph de Maistre to Mallet du Pan—Death of Louis XVI—Memoir addressed by Mallet du Pan to the Kings of Prussia and Sardinia.

ON arriving at Geneva after his mission to Frankfort, Mallet du Pan found his family there, Mme. Mallet having been able to leave Paris with her children, leaving the furniture, the plate, and the valuable library, manuscripts, and correspondence of her husband in charge of a friend. The first moments of this meeting were wholly given to their joy in meeting.

Mallet, moreover, was then full of confidence in the near success of the allied powers; but the storm was already brewing over this retreat, and it was not long in breaking forth. The 10th of August, which threw so many Swiss families into mourning, was its precursor.

In the month of September, the French army, under the command of General Montesquiou, suddenly invaded Savoy,

in despite of all treaties, and his advanced guards extended as far as the gates of Geneva, then full of the French and the Savoyard *émigrés*, who fled before the invasion. The government of the little Republic feared a sudden blow: it was not overlooked that a numerous party watched a favourable opportunity, and were on the look-out for one. He resolved to protect the city against surprise. Orders were given to strangers to leave Geneva. The greater number fled into the pays de Vaud by the lake. Their precipitate departure took place in the midst of a scene of terror, of grief, and confusion. At the same time the Council sent to Berne and to Zurich, to appeal to the Treaties of Confederation, and to beg for troops.

The Government of Berne, uneasy about the pays de Vaud, which, on the approach of the troops of the Republic, had allowed its joy to transpire, sent the battalions of its mountaineers to watch the frontiers of France and the Vaudois malcontents: a thousand men of these troops received the order to march upon Geneva, and five hundred Zurichers took the same direction. The Council which governed for the Convention, Brissot at its head, and the minister Clavière, an old Genevese, only waited this appeal to the Swiss Cantons, to have a pretext of occupation and conquest. Montesquiou was urged by them to attack Geneva, and to seize it in the name of liberty and equality: the possession of that town appeared to them absolutely necessary to strengthen the Savoyard revolution. While the French General received orders, sometimes contradictory, sometimes influenced by the intrigues of Clavière, with the army of the Alps encamped at the distance of a league from Geneva, he prepared for the attack of the town.

and brought forward his heavy artillery. In Geneva preparation was made for resistance.

The town, as a witness of these scenes related to us, presented a spectacle full of novelty and interest. All the able-bodied population was armed; those who were incorporated in the militia wore their uniform constantly; every day a strong guard was ordered out; and all who had no duty, or were not retained by indispensable business, worked at the ramparts.

“In the midst of these preparations the Swiss confederates arrived. As the Genevese territory was separated from the French village of Versoix, the Swiss embarked at Nyon, where the fleet of the Republic, consisting of several large boats armed with carronades, had gone to meet them. When this convoy entered the port with streamers and flags flying, and anchored before Molard, a shout of acclamation rent the air. The inhabitants crowded down to the borders of the lake to welcome the confederates, embracing them and conducting them to their barracks, singing patriotic airs. I remember seeing tears in many eyes. The old Swiss spirit seemed to revive, and to defy aggression; and although an attentive observer might have discerned symptoms of weakness and irresolution among the councils of the Swiss, the contagion of patriotic and warlike sentiments left at that moment no room for reflection. Very different thoughts possessed the mind of the base and vindictive man who influenced the French councils. Without respect for the independence of that land which he had called his country, and without pity for tears he was about to cause to be

shed there, Clavière had sent an order to Montesquiou to shew no mercy to Geneva.

Fortunately, the soul of Montesquiou was of a very different nature. Moreover, himself a cultivator of literature, his sympathies were all on the side of the little state which had been the birth-place of Rousseau, Bonnet, and Saussure. When the commissioners, sent to him by the council, presented themselves at his quarters, he openly expressed to them his aversion from the spirit which guided Clavière and his associates at Paris: relying with a generous policy upon the faithful observation of treaties, he recognised the neutrality of the Swiss, including the Republic of Geneva, and negotiated with them and the confederates a treaty, in virtue of which the army of the Alps was to return, and the troops of the cantons to quit the town within a certain time. It remained, to obtain from the Convention a ratification of this treaty, which could not fail to irritate to the highest pitch of resentment both Clavière and Brissot, so fatally thwarted by the moderation of the general. After delays which retarded the departure of the Swiss, the treaty was ratified; but the ruin of Montesquiou was decided; commissioners were sent from Paris to arrest him, and the conqueror of Savoy, anticipating by a quarter of an hour the orders of the council, had scarcely time to mount his horse, and accompanied by only one aide-de-camp, to enter Geneva in disguise, whence he set out the same evening by boat to take refuge in the Swiss territory.

The army of the Alps having quitted its encampment in the Plan-les-Ouates, the alarm of the Genevese subsided,

and peace appeared to be established. The confederates returned to the cantons. They left their allies in a situation of greater inquietude than might have been expected, after this effort of concord and united resistance. The love of country and independence still dominated at that time; but it was very soon about to give place to the revolutionary enthusiasm. The French revolution was at its height, the propagation of its principles the order of the day; and the contagion, extended with rapidity throughout the whole French territory, was soon to take the place of fear and hope. Hosts of timid people, at all time numerous, commenced to turn their anxious regards towards the revolutionary party to solicit its protection. "I have admired," wrote Mounier to Mallet du Pan, "the zeal, the unity, and the firmness of your fellow citizens. I will, however, say to you privately, that I fancy I have observed a shadow on the picture. I know very well that the weakness of your republic compelled it to condescend to justify itself; but I am not equally convinced that it was necessary continually to pronounce the words 'French Republic,' to say that it surely would not, *even in its cradle*, commit an injustice, and crush the country of him it regards as its founder."

Mallet was not desirous of remaining at Geneva a single day after the departure of the Swiss troops, persuaded—and his clear-sightedness did not deceive him—that the intriguing spirit of the patriots having now a clear field, would recommence to exert all its efforts until that unfortunate city, distracted within, and isolated without, would offer a bloody tribute to the revolution, and urged

by its fury, would fall into the sympathizing arms of the French Republic.

Complying with the urgent requests of a zealous friend, Baron d'Erlach de Spietz, bailli of Lausanne, Mallet proceeded with his family to the capital of the pays de Vaud. Those fine possessions of Berne, although greatly agitated were still restrained by their baillis, some of whom resisted the invasion of the revolutionary spirit and agents with more firmness than the Senate of Berne, which was divided and irresolute. None of these governors showed more firmness than the bailli d'Erlach, an old officer in the Swiss guards, a man of intelligence and resolution, inflexible as to the military honour of his country.

During this stay at Lausanne, Mallet formed new connections with the Swiss or the *émigrés* who came from France and Savoy. Among the latter we may mention the young Marquis de Salles and the Comte Joseph de Maistre, several years the junior of our author. The acquaintance between de Maistre and Mallet had been made before they met. In the month of February 1793, Mallet received the following letter :

“ Truaz in Faucigny.

“ Sir,

“ Whoever has read your writings esteems you, and without any other introduction than that sentiment which is common to all your readers, I venture to ask a favour of you. In four or five days, I shall leave a packet addressed to you, as M. Jacques Binet, jeweller, Rues-Basses, Geneva. I entreat that you will be so obliging as to take it in. A

letter which will accompany it will tell the rest. I request of you, Sir, as you will see, a very simple thing and which cannot conceal any snare—any intrigue in the modern fashion. The packet, too large for the post, is not however sufficient to fill a pocket: in receiving and in opening it, you do not pledge yourself to anything. As I have not any actual right to ask a favour of you, a refusal on your part will appear quite natural and will not reflect on your courtesy.

“Accept, Sir, the assurances of the high esteem and respectful consideration with which I am your very humble and obedient servant,

“MAISTRE,

“Late senator in the senate of Savoy.”

The packet was a manuscript accompanied by the following letter:

LETTER FROM THE COMTE DE MAISTRE TO MALLET DU PAN.

“February 28, 1793.

“Sir,

“So far as I am acquainted with you by reading your journal, it appears to me that you love to *do justice*. That is the part which you have played to the last extremity, and certainly when you quitted your tribunal, it was high time. I filled, Sir, although in a slightly different manner, the same function as yourself. Now—since the *sovereign people* of Savoy has stripped me of my scarlet without appeal, I am like Dandin—I wish to go on judging. I wish, in order to pass the time, and for the love of the good

public, to apply a few stripes of the lash to ‘the sorry hide,’ of the stupid tyrants who have given us over to execrable tyrants.

“You, Sir, know the misfortunes of Savoy : it is unnecessary to relate to you how all the secretaries of the parishes and a few dozen peasants, freely elected by force of arms, and meeting one fine morning in the great nave of a cathedral, all at once found themselves kings, and deposed their king. You are but too well acquainted with the public right—it is useless to speak to you of it ; but that which perhaps you do not know is the frightful pillage which they have dared to exercise, in the first instance against the nobility in general, and afterwards against the military body, who are not able to escape as we do. I suppress all details on this subject : the accompanying manuscript will put you in possession of the whole facts. These military, as you may well imagine, have held firm in spite of the confiscation ; but that confiscation was not the less a dreadful misfortune. The sequestrations have commenced, and already some Morisson or other, a member of the legislature, has made a report upon the subject to the amiable Convention which makes one’s hair stand on end : he proves that our military men are guilty of *treason against the nation*, and that every man who serves a tyrant in place of enjoying the blessings of liberty, ought at least to lose his property. And all this, Sir, is proved by the *eternal laws of justice*. ‘Unde nefas tantum?’

“In order to prevent this misfortune, some attempts have been made—among others an extremely awkward address to the National Assembly—in which such things are said against the nobles, that the gentlemen who signed

it deserve to be smothered in the mud. The leisure which my *new sovereign* affords me, had permitted me to take up my pen and attempt something in that line. The address to the Convention is in itself only a secondary object: it is an outline and nothing more; for I do not see that there is anything to expect from these people. Our object is to make known with dignity and tact our way of thinking, and especially to frighten the intermediate commission, which will undoubtedly be our best protection with the Convention: perhaps I may have succeeded. But, however anxious I may be, I can do nothing without assistance; and it has struck me, Sir, that you would lend me a helping-hand. You once were the fortune of your publisher; I now invite you to become the *accomplice* of an honest man. And this is what I take the liberty of asking you: First, do you think this little work worthy of printing? I might inform you that the author has never been in France; but you would say, like him of old, 'I see it!' so don't let us speak of that. Second, would you do me the honour to get it printed for me? I am assured nothing is easier at Lausanne. Third, could you in such a case promise me secrecy—that is, may I be certain, not only that I shall not be named, but also that the manuscript, after printing, will return to your hands, and will not leave them till happier times shall permit us to communicate more freely? I have kept befitting terms with the French Convention. But, as to the Allobroge Convention, I have treated it unmercifully, so that I cannot show myself just now without being compromised. You cannot think, Sir, how much it cost me to address that French Convention. Every moment I feared to defile

myself by speaking to it, and I lost sight of it as often as practicable, as you will perceive in reading. Since the great crime, all my philosophy abandons me: when I think of that unhappy France, its guilty capital, its unnatural legislators, its bloodthirsty folly, I dream of nothing but stakes, racks, and gibbets. What an age, Sir! And what will become of us? Has monarchy received an irreparable blow, or shall we be forced to throw ourselves into the arms of despotism, to obtain from it a little of that repose, which Newton called ‘*rem prorsus substantialem?*’ Perhaps, after long and terrible convulsions, men will say with another Englishman, crossing their arms:

“ ‘For forms of government let fools contest :
That which is best administered, is best.’ ”

Much profit, truly, in convulsing Europe, cutting off so many heads, burning so many castles, murdering an excellent king! But I perceive that I am prating. Excuse me, Sir, for this long letter, and the liberty I have taken. I scarcely know, indeed, from what impulse I have addressed you without having the honour of your acquaintance. If every one of those whom you have impressed with esteem, should take it into their heads to write you even a single letter, you could not stand it; and, for my part, once more, Sir, pardon my indiscretion. A senator would not have committed himself in such a manner; but I beg of you some indulgence for

“CITIZEN MAISTRE.”

The work thus entrusted to Mallet du Pan was the

"Adresse de quelques parents des militaires savoisiens, à la Convention Nationale," the first production of Joseph de Maistre, very worthy of his intellect and his pen, which Mallet hastened to have printed at Lausanne, adding to it a few lines as a preface, in which the Comte says himself, "it was easy to recognize the healthy warmth and vigorous style of a great defender of good principles."*

"It must not be thought," said Mallet, "that this work is limited in its application to the particular question of which it treats. This address is nothing more than a framework, in which the author developes truths the most important, not only for Savoy, but for all Europe, whether afflicted or menaced by those calamities which have fallen upon the duchy since it has been stocked with citizen soldiers, extreme clubbists, political jugglers, polite janissaries, who force submission to the liberty of dying from hunger, and the necessity of no longer believing in God. . . .

"This work presents just notions as to the past and present situation of Savoy, and sensible reflections on that abuse of language, by the aid of which the revolutionists at the present day, put civil society to the torture and endeavour to renovate the human race."

Something more than the conformity of their anti-revolutionary opinions induced de Maistre to select Mallet as the god-father of his first work. The fearless articles in the "*Mercur*," with their vehement and passionate

* See the recent and valuable publication of the "*Lettres et opuscules inédits*" of the Comte de Maistre, preceded by a biographical notice by his son, the Comte Rodolphe de Maistre, 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, Vaton.

elevation of style, which gave them such marked prominence, formed from the beginning a school of writers in and out of the provinces, a school of writers who, either from taste or the force of example, adopted the vigorous manner and thundering sallies of their leader. The "Adresse" bore manifest traces of this influence; but the genius of de Maistre soon emancipated itself from that imitation, partly of choice, partly involuntary, by which every writer begins his career. The Savoyard gentleman and the Genevese republican, while frequently meeting at Lausanne, and afterwards maintaining by correspondence their affectionate relations, urged on their views and their efforts, each individually in his own direction. Agreeing in the vivacity of their sentiments with regard to the French Revolution, their political creeds were somewhat different, or rather, their ideas in these matters followed different directions; certainly, they did not think in the same manner of the revolution. M. de Maistre, sounding with a religious and angry curiosity the abyss of revolutionary folly and madness, sought its divine reason, and he saw at the conclusion of this great expiation, society restored to its ancient basis in an ameliorated condition, the monarchy and the church regenerated by this terrible trial. Mallet, like de Maistre, observed the scene like an honest man indignant at injustice, and like a philosopher exasperated by the mania of argumentation. But in him the historian and the politician were, above all, awake to the present peril of society, and to the chances and means of safety which might yet remain.

Meanwhile, Mallet du Pan thought of seeking some tranquil place of residence for himself and his family. He

had already turned his eyes to England ; the Abbé Gordon, the superior of the Irish college at Paris, now returned to his country, spoke to him of some young men whose education he proposed to entrust to him ; the Chevalier de Panat on his part strenuously urged him to follow his example, and go to London. “ I learn from the public papers,” wrote the Chevalier to him, “ that the constitution of Geneva has just been abolished, and that the suppression of the distinctions of natives, *bourgeois*, and citizens, has reduced you to the French level. I foresee all the storms and misfortunes which are preparing, and perhaps you will again be obliged to quit that asylum : I presume you will go to London. I shall set out in a month at latest for that capital : I shall be delighted to meet you there, and with you that small number of wise men who were unable to save us.

“ My mind overwhelmed with so many misfortunes, and almost ready to bend under them, will find consolation and fresh courage in your society You are acquainted with my tender attachment ; my heart has need of those sentiments which you have inspired in it.”

Some time afterwards, in January 1793, after the death of the King, the Chevalier de Panat wrote to him :

“ You are expected in London ; I shall set out for that capital in a few days. I dare not take a route occupied by the patriots. The French have inspired in the conquered provinces, a horror which cannot be depicted. The terrible catastrophe has taken place, which you had so truly announced and endeavoured to prevent. But everything concurred to ruin that unfortunate monarch : the madness of the Jacobins, the cowardice and incapacity of the con-

stitutionalists, the imprudence and dissension of the aristocracy—all have led him to the scaffold by different routes! The defence of de Sèze appeared to us the work of a lawyer; we should have been more satisfied with that of Necker, in some of the views of which, there was sensibility and depth. The testament of Louis XVI. has produced a most astonishing sensation here. Who would not be affected, even to tears, on reading those expressions in which his mind and his heart are so well depicted. That testament appears to me to contain the secret of the revolution; for it was not by such virtues and such a profound resignation that its course could be arrested. Malouet writes also; his work appears to me to be extremely feeble; still, we find in it the proprieties, reason, universal morality. The sight of such horrors could not cure him of all that jargon.

“Adieu! you know my tender attachment. Come to London—that is the only theatre suitable for your talents, and I may venture to say that they are necessary to Europe at the present crisis. The hope of meeting you there is a pleasing anticipation.

“THE CHEVALIER DE PANAT.”

But circumstances occurred to prevent this project of a refuge, like so many others which Mallet du Pan was deterred from encouraging.

The death of Louis XVI., which opened the fatal year of 1793, at length gave to the French revolution that character of open menace which the European powers had been too slow in recognizing.* It was not only from the

* It must be recollected that, by the decree of the Convention on the 19th November, 1792, it formally declared that it would render aid and fraternity to all peoples who wished to recover their liberty.

tribunal, but from the revolutionary scaffold that a defiance was offered to all sovereigns, an appeal to the people of all nations to overthrow all royal power, and to constitute themselves absolute masters of society. The revolution was no longer political, but social; it was no longer French—it aimed at being universal. Society and civilization were at stake, and no longer the mere monarchy of France. So Mallet understood it; and henceforth, while giving his chief interest to the source of the evil, the focus of this contagious anarchy, he surveyed events in their relations to the common interests of society, rather than to the rights and hopes of the French Princes, and such was from that time the character of the efforts, which, exhausting his powers, brought him to the grave after four years of continual strife.

The endeavour to induce cabinets to forget their old chess-playing, their jealousies, their manœuvres of equilibrium, in order to unite together, and without ulterior views to direct against France a war of principles, was undoubtedly attempting more than appertained to a simple political philosopher; but the idea was grand, and an invincible impulse of conscience constrained him to undertake it, in spite of the opposition of his reason and his interests. At the close of January he had completed his plan. His design was to act upon the foreign cabinets so as to obtain more confidence, and to remain unconnected with Monsieur, now regent, the other princes and the *émigrés* in general. The inveterate habits of the old polity brought to light snares and projects of future aggrandizement, where there should have been nothing but close alliance in a common cause.

It was necessary to humour mistrust, if he was desirous of obtaining confidence for himself. Mallet resolved accordingly to act severally on the Princes and on the belligerent powers, though in the same spirit and with identical views.

Of his own accord, or in obedience to express solicitations, he commenced by drawing up a memoir to the Kings of Prussia and Sardinia, which was sent to those Princes in April, 1793.

In this Memoir, Mallet speaks as usual with boldness and animation, fortified as he was by assiduous observation and the information he had taken great trouble to procure.* In the first place, he directed his attention to describing the true nature of the war which the revolutionists had declared against the Allied Powers; the character and means of this war, and the shades of the dominant faction. This rapid, but complete sketch is drawn to the life: the resemblance is indisputable. The inductions which were thrown out by this political councillor without title or portfolio, are worth the trouble of quoting—at least, the principal of them. After having shown the first parties to the revolution as pursued, murdered, or compromised by the Jacobins, he comes to the latter, already divided into Girondists and Maratists: the portraiture is vigorous.

“The Jacobins, closely allied a year ago in order to dethrone the King, overthrow the constitution of 1791 and establish the Republic, separated as soon as they had

* We have now in our possession numerous documents concerning finance and military affairs, which he procured from authentic sources.

effected the object; to their former concert has succeeded a furious discord, of which the Convention is the theatre, and of which the massacre or the expulsion of one party or the other will be the next stage.

“ On the 10th of August the predominating influence, the government offices, the direction of committees, belonged to that cabal which has received the name of *Brisotists*, *Girondists*, and of which *Brissot*, the minister *Roland*, the deputies of the department of the *Gironde*, *Pétion*, &c., are the principal leaders.

“ At the head of the opposite party are *Robespierre*, *Marat*, *Danton*, and the majority of the deputies at *Paris*. They are supported by the municipality of that capital by the sections, by the *Commandant-general Santerre*, by the creatures of the *Duke of Orleans* and by the club of the *Jacobins*.

“ In the *National Convention* they have taken the name of the ‘*Montagne*,’ because they occupy the most elevated benches of the left. Long inferior in numbers to their rivals, they have at length become equal to them, and even obtain an advantage over them by the aid of a kind of third party, which is called the *Independants*. In the greater part of the violent resolutions these latter generally vote with the *Maratists*—they concurred in the murder of the *King* with as much ferocity as the latter.

“ The doctrine and the aim of the *Brisotists* consist in the establishment and organization of a Republic, pure and simple, in such a way as slightly to limit the extreme democracy by the representative government; to diminish the influence of *Paris*; to constitute the executive power on such a basis as will afford to the laws more liberty of

action; to oppose the departments to the capital; to restrain the incendiary violence of the clubs, and to terminate the revolution in the interior by the cessation of massacres, and the convulsions of anarchy. The majority voted that the judgment of the King should be referred to the people, not from any sentiment of justice, of humanity, or of compassion for that unfortunate Prince, but solely from motives of policy, in order to save the Convention from the odium of a regicide so execrable, and to avoid its effects both at home and abroad.

“The doctrine and the aim of the Maratists, consist in maintaining the continual exercise of the sovereignty of the populace, in arming insurrections against the laws, and the overthrow of authority by force, as soon as it appears to become a curb; the endeavour to make popular assemblies dominate over the Convention, to transfer power and office to the most licentious immoderate agitators, to make a vigorous application of the rights of man—that is to say, to assure to the people, under the name of liberty, a permanent licence and impunity—and to consecrate equality by agrarian laws, referring to landed property and official appointments. Such is the system which has very justly been called the *Sans-culotterie*, and of which they expected to realize the complete working while their terrified antagonists wished to modify it by some limitations.

“Notwithstanding this difference in their designs, these two factions resemble each other in possessing an equal degree of perversity. It would be a delusion to imagine that there is more probity or scrupulousness among the Brissotists. More dexterous, less ferocious, less impatient than their adversaries, they surpass them in subtlety. Can-

ning in preparing the circumstances for crime, they leave it to their rivals to execute more crimes than the circumstances demand. The circumspection of their manœuvres is more refined and more precise. Thus, after having absolved and rewarded the executioners, who filled the *glacière* of Avignon with corpses ; after having plotted the conspiracy of the 20th of June, and that of the 10th of August, they justified the carnage of that day and the following, but they blamed that of the month of September, as useless for the consummation of their crimes, and as suited to terrify Europe, which they aspire to draw under the tender bonds of their fraternity.

“ A league of men who carry almost to fanaticism their contempt for all religion and obedience ; who vaunt their atheism in the midst of the legislative body ; who have proscribed the word “ honour ;” constituted murder, robbery, and poison,* a duty ; strangers to all shame, to all moral sentiment existing but rapine ; consumed by pride, and thinking themselves invincible from four years of triumph ; such a league, which respects no right and knows no duty, will not, during its existence, allow any state to remain in tranquillity, any throne to be secure, any war to end without meditating another.

“ The duration of the struggle which it sustains with

* In a petition then recently sent by the Faubourgs of Paris and read before the Convention, these words are found : “ Form without delay a corps of tyrannicides, and let its chief be selected from among you. Fire, sword, and poison, are lawful arms in the defence of liberty.” The Convention applauded this petition, ordered that it should be printed and sent to the departments, and gave the petitioners the honours of the houses.

crowns, ennobles this handful of scoundrels and weakens the consideration of legitimate governments. Nothing degrades them more in the eyes of this people, than the spectacle of their incapacity to avenge their insults and dignity.

“In order to put an end to this humiliating crisis, extraordinary measures are required. It is necessary to effect good by taking advantage of some of the lessons which have taught the revolutionists to effect evil; these have been entirely neglected. Two monarchs alone have stirred during the last year, for a cause which is to decide whether crowns are to be changed into *bonnets rouges*. Mistaking the internal condition of the kingdom, and the means of acquiring decisive advantages, they have lost an irreparable opportunity, allowed the Jacobins to destroy all the facilities for a counter-revolution, entered upon a lingering campaign, upon a poor and difficult frontier, with armies not exceeding one hundred and twenty-five thousand men, insufficient even to hold their immense defensive position from Ostend to the Palatinate.

“To forces so imperfect was added an exaggerated confidence in the weakness of the enemy: pernicious delays, intervals between the operations, slow and limited marches, have given the enemy time to recover and fortify themselves. The other party found themselves harrassed with fatigue, and their forces diminished by the loss of ten thousand men, almost before they had fired a single cannon-ball. So many faults, necessary consequences of a vicious plan, and the fundamental error of allowing the proper time to pass by, have been crowned by the frightful want of discipline among the troops, who have alienated the people

whom they ought to have conciliated ; by the neglect of all proper measures of intimidating the bad, and encouraging the good ; and, finally, by a retreat which has placed all Europe on the verge of ruin.”

To what conduct did he point to avoid the recurrence of the same faults and the same results ? Here Mallet shows, that he had only too well penetrated the disposition of Prussia to treat, rather than fight with vigour. He appears to have feared that the first burst of the Prince of Coburg would not be maintained, and that he would fall into his former fatal laxity.

“ The progress of the war should not be stayed, in order to enter into any conferences or negociations. If the Convention sees the enemy losing time in parleying, weakness is immediately suspected, the public are informed of it, and confidence is restored. The interviews and correspondence which were entered into with Dumouriez in September last, immediately confirmed the position of the Republicans ; from that moment the fear of the Russian army, the respect which was shown towards it, and the hope which it inspired in good citizens were never recovered again.

“ To negotiate with men who have no government, who amuse themselves with oaths and promises, whose politics are but a collection of impostures, and who never use that species of weapon but to escape imminent danger, is to lose all the advantages of success, and to aggravate the difficulty of obtaining it.

“ It must be said openly, the proclamation of the Prince of Cobourg, and the summons of the English

Commodore at Dunkirk have done more harm than a defeat. All parties, and all persons in France have inferred from it that the Allied Powers were timid; the haughtiness of the replies made by the patriots to those ridiculous attempts at conciliation, strongly contrasts with the timidity of such advances, and inspires the nation with nothing but contempt for foreign cabinets and generals.

“As for the war, it must be renewed. The conduct of Dumouriez in the last campaign, and at the commencement of this, offers a model of the kind of war which suits the Revolutionary troops, and also that which it is important to bring to bear against them.

“The plans of studied tactics, the science of military combinations, and the prudence which avoids leaving anything to chance, are utterly ruinous against an immense collection of wavering and irregular troops, whose impetuous attack constitutes their force. Those armies are conducted, not by Turennes and Montecuculis, but by chiefs who would not be able to move them, except by leaving them to the audacity of their own impulses.

“By reflecting upon their composition and their character, it becomes evident that an offensive and rapid war would overthrow and disperse them in a very short time. The campaign of the Prince of Cobourg, the celerity of his forced marches, his prompt and closely-followed attacks, destroyed or dispersed in one month upwards of eighty thousand men, opposed by an army less than half as numerous, supported by an immense artillery, and directed by the indefatigable genius of Dumouriez. Timid and defensive operations, on the contrary, will be the inevitable

ruin of the combined armies. All slackening after obtaining advantages destroys the fruits of them."

Mallet concludes with an observation which is the necessary conclusion of his memoir, and of which events were soon about to confirm the justice.

"So long as the armies do not penetrate into the interior of France, so long as they do not go to the focus of the conflagration, so long as they do not attack the very existence of the Convention, which caused the excitement, we must expect a protracted war and perpetual troubles, if sluggishness obliges a compromise with the revolution.

"Whatever may be the plans of the coalition, whether or not they project the dismemberment of some provinces ; it will be lost if it forgets that society, humanity, the security of governments, public order, the present and future generations, are now weighed against a confederacy of scoundrels ; if it forgets that the principles of the revolution are incompatible with those of all legitimate sovereignty and obedience to law ; if it forgets that all the thrones will be jeopardized by allowing to exist as a monument of impunity an anarchy founded upon crime, and by crime ; if the innocent blood of the best of kings, dragged to the scaffold after four years of abominable outrages, which all reflect upon royalty, provoke nothing more than futile lamentations and an ignominious peace ; if, finally, Europe do not call to its aid the means which can be developed in France to establish there a monarchical government."

The King of Prussia officially communicated his thanks to the author of the memoir eulogized it, and assured

him that he would profit by its precepts. The Minister of Sardinia went still further, and urged Mallet, through the Baron de Vignet des Etoles, to go to Turin. These acknowledgements were sincere: the man and his language were esteemed, and the forcibleness of his advice was recognized; but the diplomatic habits had the advantage of him, and the practice of the old diplomacy, like that of the old tactics, was still to exercise its sway. Nevertheless, the memoir was not without influence upon the agreement formed at that moment between the King of Sardinia and the Cabinet of London, according to which, Victor Amedée engaged to hold his army on the footing of fifty thousand men on the annual payment of five millions.

Meanwhile Mallet endeavoured to join the Maréchal de Castries who urged him to come to him and converse upon important subjects.

CHAPTER XIV.

(1793.)

Letter of Maréchal de Castries—Mallet du Pan goes to Brussels—

The Arch-Duke Charles, Lord Elgin, Sir J. Macpherson—Proceedings of Dumouriez—Mallet publishes the “*Considérations sur la Révolution française*”—Indignation of the *émigrés*—Letter of Montlosier—Letter to Maréchal de Castries.

IN the beginning of February the Marshal had written to Mallet du Pan exhorting him to make his voice heard in this crisis.

LETTER OF MARÉCHAL DE CASTRIES TO MALLET DU PAN.

“The events which have succeeded each other, Sir, are so atrocious that they have suspended all my faculties; nevertheless, it will not do to be discouraged by the factions who must sooner or later succumb. One of the most powerful means of contributing to this result is certainly to make known their conduct and their crimes. I have seen the impression which your writings made upon all worthy minds . . . it is time to address the nation, and point out its situation. It is necessary that civil measures should proceed in the interior at the same time as military operations, in order to render the progress

which may be made useful and permanent. A period will ultimately arrive when it will be necessary to lay down principles, a great part of which will entirely depend upon circumstances I should wish, from my attachment to the public cause, that you should make a journey into this country, as you did last year. You determined to take that step from motives less powerful than those which the actual situation present ; therefore, I hope that you will do in this respect whatever may lie in your power."

Before deciding, Mallet consulted Mounier, who then lived at Morat in retirement, from whence the Princes had no inclination to call him, but where they now and then went to ask his advice. Mounier advised him to go. "When you are near them, you will succeed in making them hear the truth. You will encounter great obstacles, because they are more ignorant, more blinded by their misfortunes than they have ever been. The Baron de Castelnau is, as you are aware, one of the best informed and most loyal of this party ; he told me in his last letter that my principles are very monarchical, but that they are not those of the French monarchy ; that my name, my opinions, and my principles were so well known, that if the Princes were to recall me, there could not be any hope of an immediate conciliation."

Mallet determined to go and meet M. de Castries, although the latter had not explained himself as to the object of the proposed interview. He was, moreover, induced to go to Germany, in the hope of forming there some arrangement which would make up for the resources

of which the revolution had just deprived him. Afterwards he met with Montlosier there, who had just before feelingly reproached him for his long silence, and had generously offered him money and assistance.

LETTER FROM M. DE MONTLOSIER TO MALLET DU PAN.

“ Dusseldorf, March, 1793.

“ I shall not go to Switzerland to seek for you, my friend, since you do not wish it ; I will wait for you here. You must believe that I shall have great pleasure in seeing you and talking over your projects and my own. As to my own projects, however, I have not quite made up my mind. In this general confusion of all persons and things, I do not know to whom or to what to attach myself. It will not do to throw myself into the orbit, unless there is some fixed star round which the course of my little planet could have success. Meanwhile, I love to surround myself with friendship. Two ladies with whom I have accidentally made acquaintance, have constituted all my happiness and all my occupation this winter.

“ You had good reason, my dear friend, to despair at the sluggishness of the Allied Powers. It is a miracle that Maestricht did not surrender like Bréda. Without the *émigrés* and without the firmness of the Prince of Hesse, there is no knowing what would have happened. . . . Monsieur, on learning that the siege was raised, replied immediately to M. de Blangy : ‘ It is not Maestricht which is saved—it is France.’ He had reason to say so, at least as regards the actual campaign. General Coburg said positively, that he trembled lest he should arrive too late, and

that if he had found Maestricht taken, he should have fallen back to wait for more considerable forces. . . .

“ I have taken a great interest in all your misfortunes. I have communicated them to our friends, who interest themselves about you, as you may imagine. In spite of the Abbé de Fontenay, you have still more partisans among us than you would imagine, and they are very warm ones. I do not doubt but that your enterprise, whatever it may be, will meet with success. I suppose that you go to Frankfort well prepared to put it in execution ; for you know as well as I that you will require assistance in it ; but whether you undertake it alone or whether I join you, about which I am not quite decided, I will say this much, —I have nearly five hundred louis with which I can dispense within a short time—I offer them to you with all my heart. If we were to take some pains and settle ourselves at our ease in a territory somewhat free, I think we might easily command public opinion, and that we should have a very great influence even upon the direction of the cabinets. It is necessary in the first instance to provide ourselves with good and eligible correspondents, in order to have at the same time the merit of vigour to persuade, and of novelty for the fact. I am entirely of your opinion, as to the advantage which the Allied Powers might have derived from the death of the King : it was one among so many other of their great errors.”

At last Mallet commenced his journey in the spring ; but it was said that he would not be able to join M. de Castries, who was continually summoned to change his residence to attend the Regent. Going from one place of

meeting to another, obliged to avoid the quarters of the Prince in order to avoid the gossips and intriguers, lost upon the road, and always running about, Mallet did not know anything as to his destination nor even the object of his journey. He fatigued himself with this uncertainty, and persuading M. de Castries that he might serve the Prince better at a distance than when near, he went to Frankfort and from thence to Brussels. A great number of persons of influence in the politics of Europe were assembled in that capital, all attentively watching and strongly interested in the issue of the campaign, which had just been opened so wonderfully by the Prince of Coburg, and appeared to promise to the allies a decisive revenge for their mortifying disasters of 1792. Nevertheless, the first start of the Prince had been already followed by a hesitation and a timidity which left room for conjectures. The solitary retirement of Dumouriez, whom the army would not follow, had been paid much more than it was worth by the long preliminaries and the last suspension of hostilities, by which the French armies had profited to rally themselves and repair their defeats. Men of perception began to see that the strife might not be so near its termination, and that nothing was to be neglected to escape from this humiliating situation. Every one felt the want of being able to obtain just perceptions of the public spirit and the state of parties in France, and as to the true nature of the opposition which the coalition would encounter in the interior and the means of resisting it. No light was expected to be thrown upon any of these points by the *émigrés*, always given up to their illusions, and naturally

persuaded that all France opened its arms to them as its liberators.

The consideration which Mallet enjoyed abroad, the independence of his character, and especially the confidence which the unfortunate Louis XVI was known to have placed in him, contributed to give to his advice and opinions all the weight which the opinions of a single individual can obtain. From the time of his arrival, his society and conversation were sought after by all the ministers of the allied powers, and other persons of distinction, such as M. de Mercy and the Archduke Charles, who had just distinguished himself at Nerwinde, and to whom the Emperor destined the future government of the Low Countries. More familiar relations were also established between Mallet and a worthy Scotch gentleman, Sir John Macpherson, who had occupied an important position in India, and enjoyed the especial confidence of the Emperor and the Archduke. The frankness and good-nature of this excellent man, warm in his sentiments and moderate in his opinions, reminded Mallet of his friends in Switzerland—for nothing so much resembles a Swiss mountaineer as a Scotch mountaineer. It was he who presented his new friend to the Archduke Charles. In the first visit the Prince received the journalist with distinction, and allowed the conversation to turn upon important subjects. While conversing, the Archduke did not fail to remark that Mallet expressed himself with an ardent candour, occasionally supported by a certain slight stamping of the foot not customary in courtly society: he afterwards said laughingly to Sir J. Macpherson, that his friend had something

republican in his manners. "The gracious reception which he accorded me," wrote Mallet in a private letter "did not diminish my candour; I put before him some harsh truths: they have gained me still more esteem. With M. de Mercy the same language, the same reception."

From Brussels, Mallet went to the siege of Valenciennes, still invested by the imperial troops. He had a compatriot at head-quarters, a great admirer of his writings, General Frossard a Swiss, from the Vaud county, who had served in the Austrian army throughout the last campaign in Turkey, and now attached to the garrison staff, observed and judged events in the same spirit as Mallet. But as it was not the custom to think so boldly in the army, our prudent Swiss, to whom d'Erlach had introduced Mallet, was glad to have some one to exchange ideas with, and became for some time his assiduous correspondent. It was at his invitation that Mallet went to the siege of Valenciennes, where he received military honours, a little too much in detail; for in crossing a battery he was saluted with several cannon balls, one of which passed very close to him through an embrasure.

Towards this time, Dumouriez, a refugee in London, but always occupied with projects, sent to Mallet, through his aide-de-camp, Colonel Thouvenot, to complain of the errors of the *émigrés*, and his general views of the counter-revolution. The letter of the Colonel, although written in his own name, was a political overture of Dumouriez, who gave Mallet du Pan credit for a greater influence over the Princes than he really had, and that he occupied a place in their councils which he never possessed.*

* This letter will be found in the notes and explanations.

"If you consider my opinions just," said he to Mallet in conclusion, "if you make them appreciated by those who ought to co-operate in the re-establishment of the social system; let us act in concert, and be the intermediate party necessary to reunite two parties apparently opposed, but susceptible of a useful reconciliation, when that has for its basis reason and reasoning."

Mallet did not repulse this appeal of Thouvenot, or rather of Dumouriez himself, for his conciliatory intervention. He undertook, not without restriction, but also without success, to lay before the Princes the views of the General; such at least may be inferred from a letter addressed to Mallet by the Prince de Salm:

"What extraordinary chance has led you to become the chosen censor of Dumouriez, to mediate between him and the Princes! I am quite of your opinion as to the fundamental points, which have, as you say, made you find yourself in contact with the former, but I think as you do that they will be rejected."

Having returned to Brussels, Mallet did not cease for nearly three months to act, to speak, and to write. All parties addressed themselves to him—all requested suggestions from him. Overwhelmed with questions and correspondence,* having to combat all kinds of prejudices and moral difficulties, filled with a lively sense of anxiety as to

* Not to speak of the proposals of publishers, one of the most respectable publishers in London, P. Elmsly, the editor (?) of Gibbon, requested Mallet, in terms at once pressing and respectful, to send him for the "*St. James's Chronicle*," a journal in high estimation, a letter by express on the state of France and the events of the war.

the issue of the campaign, and the turn which the affairs of Europe were taking, he exerted himself beyond his powers : his health began to suffer, and he never entirely recovered his first attack. It was during this short stay at Brussels that Mallet wrote the best known of his works, the "*Considérations sur la Révolution Française*," which appeared on the 8th of March, 1793.

Without accepting all the advice which Mallet put forward in his Memoirs and conversation, the justice of the views upon which they were founded was recognised, and it was thought advisable that the public should be made acquainted with them. He therefore exerted himself to influence public opinion forcibly ; to display the emigration in its true light, by speaking severely of its absurdities and its errors ; to render the intervention of the allied powers more independent, and to make it appear more spontaneous. If we are not able to affirm that this was the precise intention of the work, it is at least certain that by the author's own confession, the "*Considérations*" were composed at the urgent solicitation of, and upon a plan agreed upon by persons at the head of affairs.

However that may be, Mallet brought all his talents into action when he drew this picture, already sketched out more than once, but never in those proportions and with equal force of sense and style ; although it may be regretted that the sentiment which was excited in him by the sight of the revolutionary excesses and the dangers of Europe has sometimes communicated to his writings an excess of energy.

"At such a time as this," thus commences the author of the "*Considérations*," "one ought, after having dis-

charged his duties to society, to lead a retired life, and above all, not to be ambitious of making a figure. For," he adds, "the fluctuation of events imposes silence upon all judicious men: there are no longer any in the right but pretended, sham wits, for the history of the time is but a catalogue of untruths." But respectable persons who, having been pressed to publish their opinions and consented, have a right to do so: "For," says he, "every European is at this day involved in this last struggle of civilization; we have embarked ourselves and our possessions on the vessel; now, on the eve of the shipwreck we must not—

“ ‘ Laisser la crainte au pilote
Et la manœuvre aux matelots.’ ”

Every man has a right to express his anxieties: the revolution being, so to speak, cosmopolite, it has ceased to belong to France alone."

We do not intend to enter into an analysis of this work, the best known of all Mallet's writings; it will be sufficient to point out the scope and the essential traits of the object of these "Considerations." To present, in all its force, and in all its extent, the danger, such as it is—that is to say, the mighty revolution, social in its essence, marching fatally on to a republic, precisely because it ruined the arts and industry; from its military state irresistibly led to become conquering; to signalize the illusions and the errors of the discontented; and finally to make clear to the eyes of Europe the necessity of a war of indignation, not of reaction, of a strife proportionate to the magnitude and calculated upon the forces and the tactics of the enemy—such were

the principal aims which the author of the "Considérations" was desirous of attaining. This he did, by reviewing the facts of the revolutionary history in such a way as to show their terrible connection, and to prove that there were moments in which the chain might have been broken, if an acquaintance with the true state of France and an understanding of the passions stirred up by the revolutionary faction, had directed the undecided will and hesitating action of the revolutionary governments.

Never, until then, had any one summed up and sounded the evils of France and of society with an equal firmness of view. But there had never yet been a system of conduct so boldly and definitely proposed, which kept clear of those points which referred to the intractable customs of court politics, and the still more intractable pretensions of the majority of the *émigrés*.

"All revolutions," says he, "present a combination of enthusiasm, depravity, and weakness. The method of combating them consists, therefore, in subjugating the depravity, disenchanting the enthusiasm, and affording protection to the weakness. Thus, when a new doctrine has taken possession of people's minds, care must be taken not to oppose it by force alone; for cannons can never kill sentiments: they may kill the impostors, the rogues, the brigands, who lead away the mob by pernicious opinions; but the sure means to remain subordinate to them, or to resuscitate them, would be, on the one part, to allow them to pass unpunished, and on the other, to desire to immolate them, with all those opinions which they have perverted, and which would outlive them, and whose instantaneous suppression would ruin the moral con-

trol, without which it is impossible at the present time to govern men. It is, therefore, necessary to abandon to political boasters the idea that force alone can succeed in subduing the kingdom. The possible submission—that which should be desired,—that which, by destroying the foundations of a ferocious anarchy would prevent fresh revolutions, will never result from any course except the union of *force* and *persuasion*.”

That, in fact, if erroneous opinions had been entertained abroad as to the dispositions of France, there was also error in France as to the disposition of foreign powers, and it was these that required to be dispelled.

“How can the people,” said Mallet to foreigners, the soldiers, the whole nation, “oppose these prejudices so long as they remain between the false friends who would perpetuate their credulity, and the enemies who would disdain to undeceive them? Still they are indignant at the continuance of the public delusion! still they fail to explain resistance while they furnish food to it. Ah! when it is intended to lead man, it is necessary to take the trouble to study the human heart, to direct its inclinations and enlighten its decisions! If it were permitted me to penetrate into the cabinets of Europe, I should perhaps find but little confidence in the effects of a public manifestation, which should declare to the French nation and to all other nations, the reasons that make the present war a truly social war.

“It has been too frequently and too foolishly repeated, that the war was in the King’s cause: this saying of the ante-chamber has passed from the mouths of the courtiers to those of the anarchists: there is no need of asking these

latter if it serves to popularize their interests or not, by making them regarded as interests common to the people, and in opposition to those of sovereigns. I declare boldly that, if this were the case, the revolution would be indestructible : but it will perish ; for it is still more an outrage upon the people than upon governments ; for it is directed against the right of nations far more than it is in favour of the rights of man.

“ Why do not the allied powers make this evident, by showing to the French that their welfare, inseparable from that of Europe, makes the war a necessity.

“ Two errors,”—here Mallet addresses himself to the royalists, “ have succeeded each other, both equally dangerous. The same impetuosity of judgment which caused all those who partook in any of the opinions of the time to be looked upon as incorrigible revolutionists, now precipitates many minds into the false idea that, with the exception of the extreme republicans, all those who are undeceived, aspire to return to the precise state from which they started.

“ We must not deceive ourselves : the spirit of the Revolution would continue to go on as it has gone on before ; it has entered into the brains of the oppressed. The Jacobins are held in detestation ; a government is called for which would annihilate anarchy, harass and terror. But new interests have been developed by these vicissitudes. It is very easy to say on the back of a pamphlet, that individual interests constitute the sole strength of the Revolution ; it would be destroyed, and the state saved the moment they were sacrificed. The factious have prepared their downfall by reasoning in the same manner

And in what consists the general interest, if it be not in harmony with individual interests? What opposition would you not have to expect if you founded a new order of things, whatever it might be, upon discontent and desperation."

Foreseeing that his opinions might displease some Mallet concludes his work with this remark :

"If some self-willed spirits to whom meditation is punishment, and moderation treason, should draw inferences from my opinions, as to my secret inclination to liberty, I would reply to them, that, born under her sway, and nourished with her teaching, she has taught me one lesson with which I was profoundly impressed long before the year 1789—it is, that France will be incapable of supporting political liberty, without thirty years of preliminary education."

In the midst of the shower of pamphlets, which poured without intermission from the pens of the *émigrés*, to predict the impending downfall of the revolutionary *régime*, this fell like a clap of thunder. Abroad, the "Considérations" were received with an esteem which was signal, though, perhaps, affected: the lesson which it ventured to give to foreign cabinets, caused no displeasure, when weighed against the severe truths addressed to the disturbed and embarrassed *émigrés*. The Archduke sent one of his chamberlains to beg the author to proceed to his court. There he found the Comtes de Mercy and Metternich, the envoy of Prussia, and there he received formal thanks and "compliments which I but little merited," wrote Mallet. The English government sent him the same acknowledgments. It was in London that the work made the most

powerful sensation ; it was reprinted there, and translated immediately.

Burke having read it, declared that it appeared to him as if he had written it himself. The chancellor Loughborough, in a letter to Sir James Macpherson, expressed high esteem for the writer. But the wrath of the emigrants burst forth with vehemence : we shall understand their feelings by reading the bitter reproaches addressed to them by Mallet :

“How ill-judging were those pitiless calculators, who found consolation in a misunderstanding ; who, rejoicing in the increase of disorders, placed their confidence in the crimes which were the crowning stroke of the Revolution. What a foe to monarchy was a certain violent anonymous writer, who wrote on the back of a pamphlet, “No compromise ;” and undertook to prove to a majority, at the head of two hundred thousand soldiers, fifty fortresses, and all the resources of the empire, that, having no right to expect quarter, self-interest required them not to grant any.

“It is to the sophisms of this party spirit, to the various causes that we have just analysed, to that systematic emigration which separated the King from his supporters, the kingdom from the royalists, property from proprietors, a party from its partisans, and which, by an unconscious compliance with the secret views of the republicans, destroyed all confidence in those aids that patience might have organized in the interior, and for which no substitute occurred—that the Revolution is indebted for the horrors which have characterized it during the last year.

“It is indebted for these horrors, not only to that measure which the seriousness of the anarchy should have

reserved for women, for old men, for the heirs to the throne, for men prominent in public matters, and threatened by popular fury, but also to its concurrence with foreign intervention.

“It is indebted for these horrors to the counsels which subordinated it wholly to the uncertain decisions of a few irresolute cabinets, and to an unmeaning torrent of promises and threats, poured forth by writers whom passion had blinded, and who, while they supplied the Jacobins with pretexts for crimes, and means of despotic sway, had effectually worn out the springs of fear before the allied army appeared on the frontiers.

“It is indebted for these horrors to the scandal of the divisions by which the royalist party was torn to pieces; the monarchy, the monarch, the rights of property, three hundred thousand families, even hopes of better days, all actually perishing beneath the axe of an atrocious faction, and the victims meantime disputing on the comparative advantage of two chambers or three—on the ancient monarchy and the capitularies of Charlemagne! A hundred idle and interminable controversies daily supplied food for animosity: these madmen fought, nay, still fight, with the very weapons which are wounding themselves. Never could they be persuaded to act with a grain of political common sense; a necessity for mutual hatred seemed to prey upon them; they hunted each other into the arms of their assassins; no dungeons—not death itself—could disarm their enmity. Each section of the party attached to monarchical government anathematized all those whose views did not move along the same geometrical line as its own; instead of adjourning their debates,

instead of falling back on points of agreement, on the very brink of the abyss they doggedly persisted in defending against each other the points of difference."

It must be acknowledged, that the inflexible burin of Mallet, has delineated some of these traits with an excessive sharpness which constitutes his chief defect as a writer. No doubt, emigration was a great misfortune and a great fault,—if in politics an act compelled by circumstances can be accounted a fault; but the editor of the "*Mercur*" had by anticipation replied to his own arguments, by demonstrating that the revolutionary spirit which had set fire to houses, lodged informations, prompted murder and every kind of persecution, had rendered it the sole means of safety for the persons and families of thousands of country gentlemen. He was frankly, but kindly and politely reminded of this, in a private letter addressed to him by a noble emigrant. Others sorrowfully admitted the justice of his reproaches; and if it must be confessed that Mallet might have dealt more gently with minds embittered by prolonged sufferings, it is no less certain that nothing could surpass the blindness, haughtiness and intriguing ambition of but too many emigrants; instances of which, equally absurd and hateful, were continually before the eyes of the author of the "*Considérations*."

We shall best learn what a tempest this work stirred up among the French at Brussels, from a private letter of Mallet:

"While so favourable a judgment was passed upon me by those in office, and by as many others in this place as are of a certain rank, or possess a little common sense

the rabble of the emigrants were giving utterance to furious cries. Grouped in the Park, like the Jacobins in the Palais Royal, a few hundred hare-brained fellows, decorated with collars and crosses could talk of nothing but hanging me, after the counter-revolution. They resolved to send a deputation to Count Metternich, to denounce me as a Republican. For the last ten days, my unlucky pamphlet has been the subject of discussion in all circles. Women take violent part, for or against it. However, victory has almost always remained with my party, which gains ground from day to day. Montlosier has been most useful; his warm friendship has carried him, armed at all points, over the breach."

Pamphlets now poured down on Mallet. The most worthy of notice were a letter by the Chevalier de Guer, and a pretended congratulatory epistle from M. Necker to the author of the "*Considérations*," in which the latter and the ex-minister are represented as the unconscious friends of the Convention. This last pamphlet, the production of the Abbé Talbert, provoked Montlosier exceedingly; he sent these epistles to Mallet, exhorting him to return a spirited answer. Mallet, thus pressed, sent his friends materials for a reply, to which Montlosier prefixed a preliminary discourse; but the reader would learn nothing from these wretched controversies, and must excuse our recording them. The mind of our politician was too anxiously intent on military occurrences to occupy itself with these petty broils. Unhappily, neither eloquence nor reason had power to alter the course of war, or the tactics of generals. How would the fate of the campaign be decided?

“All is still in uncertainty,” writes Mallet, on the 20th of August. “It is impossible to account for the conduct of the Prince of Coburg, who, after dispersing Cæsar’s camp, without striking a blow; after advancing beyond Cambrai, and summoning that town to surrender, has retraced his steps for the purpose of laying siege to Quesnoy and Maubeuge, while the Duke of York has marched upon Bergues and Dunkirk. They would have a safe war, in which nothing is risked—not a pawn lost, no uneasiness felt with regard to consequences. Thirty-five thousand more Austrians have arrived; but what we need is a more active, more enterprising leader.”

Malouet, writing to his friend, expresses the like uneasiness. His letter, and other facts afterwards to be related, will prove that many Frenchmen, ardently attached to their country, felt no scruple with regard to a war conducted by foreigners. In M. de Chateaubriand’s *Memoirs*, we have seen the formal expression of Malesherbes’ opinion on this difficult point; and Malouet’s view concurred with that of this excellent person. In the minds of these men—good Frenchmen, assuredly—the Convention was not France.

LETTER FROM MALOUE TO MALLET DU PAN.

“London, 26th August.

“I have received your work and your letter, my dear friend; both affected me deeply. You brand the evil, as you say, with a red-hot iron; but, for good, what hope do you leave us? However, I will send you a paper which I presented last February to the English Minister, on the cha-

racter, the motives, and the means, of this war. There you will perceive the perfect conformity of our views and conjectures. It has had no effect. The cabinet of London, more enlightened than the others, is shackled by circumstances and national prejudices which leave it little advantage over other ministries. I firmly believe that the sole interest of England is to preserve what she has, and remain as she is; but the development of power presented by France, in its actual state of disorganization, excites a sort of terror as to what she might do with a good government, as if a good government would not inevitably conduce to the order, the tranquillity, the happiness even of other nations. These erroneous ideas have prevailed everywhere and over all considerations; and the ferocious passions of the French people reappear with but slight modification in almost all parts of Europe. Pride and cupidity blind great national directories, as well as that of the Jacobins. Nevertheless, in spite of the weight of your opinion, which I value highly, I look upon the destruction of the French Republic in this third campaign as inevitable. It is impossible that their assignat-factory should stand beyond six months; and the partition which it remains for them to make, will reinforce the royalists of the interior by the proprietors of all parties.

“All you tell me of Switzerland, Savoy, and the aid to be given to the royalists, I have said and written. I have again transmitted extracts from your letters. But who directs the coalition? Which cabinet preponderates? I know not. I perceive that here Austria is well spoken of, Prussia mistrusted, and that an influence seems to be exerted over Spain and the Court of Turin. Yet what

has this influence effected? The operations in the south are pitiable, those of the north enough to drive me to despair, since the retreat of the Prince of Coburg.

"You say you saw Mounier as he passed through Brussels. I reckon on his being here in a few days. I think I informed you that in his present distressed circumstances, I have procured him a temporary resource. He is coming hither to take over with him to Switzerland the son of Lord Hawke. Next year, if no change take place in my position, I shall look out for such another engagement on my own account. I have executed your commissions to the Abbé Bertrand and Gibbon: I am to pass a couple of days with the latter at Lord Sheffield's.

"Tell me your plans. If you think of writing and setting up a newspaper, your present situation is more advantageous than one in England, where even the best French works are but little sought after. The English admire none but their own authors, and are interested only in their own concerns."

Still, it was necessary to come to an understanding with M. de Castries. In fact, neither the Regent nor the Marshal had been consulted as to the propriety of the "*Considérations*:" Mallet was bent on assisting them as he judged best, and not as they pleased. The Marshal showed some anxiety on hearing of the work in hand. He had already given Mallet to understand, on the subject of his memoir, that had he been consulted, certain facts might have been brought forward which would have necessitated some change in the arrangement of the piece. When he inquired after the copies of the "*Considérations*," which Mallet informed him were prepared for himself and

the Regent, and which he had not yet received, M. de Castries wrote :—" I find, however, by letters which have arrived here (Nimèguen) that the work is already known at Brussels, and effects much indeed—but to the injury of its own cause : I hope there is nothing in the book likely to injure those whose cause you embrace." On the 4th September, in answer to renewed expressions of uneasiness on the part of the Marshal, Mallet wrote the following letter, which shows how severe was the task imposed upon him by his devotion.

LETTER TO THE MARSHAL DE CASTRIES.

" 24th September, 1798.

" Monsieur le Maréchal,

" My uncertainty as to the greater or less duration of your stay in Westphalia, was one cause of my silence ; but my health, deranged by excessive and ceaseless labour, and the mental anxiety accompanying it, during these last three months, has not less contributed to this.

" It appears to me, Monsieur le Maréchal, that you have become alarmed as to my occupations, as well as on the subject of the persons whom I endeavoured to work upon. If your fears refer to Frenchmen, I have seen none except three friends as retired as myself.

" As regards foreigners, I was bound to try my power with those who direct, who exert great influence, and who required to be persuaded ; those who already are so, unfortunately but few in number, have no need of remonstrances and arguments. Being without any consequence,

and neutralized, I was in a position frankly to enlarge upon a variety of considerations that would not have been tolerated from another mouth. The set speech of my antagonists habitually runs as follows :—‘ *You speak thus because your interest is concerned in the counter-revolution.*’ Where there is least mind, there this prejudice has the strongest hold. It became, then, necessary, under pain of downright denial, to adopt another plan ; but the evil affects so many details, interests, and fallacies, that its cure cannot be promptly effected. It has given occasion for plans which nullify the main object, and the carrying out of which will render this campaign not indeed as disastrous, but as unprofitable as the preceding one.

“ As to the principles which actuated me both in writing and speaking, it required neither intellectual efforts nor mystery to develop them. I confined myself to representing that the revolution would destroy the war, if war were waged against *anything but the revolution* ; that no man whatsoever would rise in France in favour of strangers ; that by persisting in not honestly declaring for the re-establishment of the King and royalty, the royalists of the interior were set against the powers, every rallying point was annihilated, and the Convention would be exasperated but not weakened. That the choice must be made between peace and a terrible war ; that the middle course actually adopted, or any other that might be suggested by circumstances, only served to confirm the power of the Jacobins, and to legitimate in the people’s eyes the excess of their tyranny. I urged my auditors to realize the certainty and extent of the danger, to oppose it everywhere, and above

all, with the true weapons, and to abandon the delusion that the monster could be subdued by sieges, systematic transfers of troops, and a few towns taken.

“Such, Monsieur le Maréchal, is the field of action to which I have confined myself; avoiding all accessory but uncalled-for questions, or which might offend even prejudice.

“I was solicited to expound my notions and make them public, to the end that so much going to and fro, notes without end, and private deductions, which impress but slightly and that too slowly, might be spared. I took my pen and printed my work. No one knew anything about it, and I had announced beforehand that I should be guided only by my own convictions. This production created a considerable sensation in certain cabinets. It was to them, to any one whose influence bears on the present crisis, that I addressed myself; not to the mob of mad or furious men, whom misfortune has robbed of reason, and whose excesses can only be forgiven in consideration of the sufferings which occasion them. It is natural that adversity should derange those spirits which have not been inured to it—that it should not have given them one lesson, or idea, or notion on any subject: it is natural that they should beat the air; that, utterly nullified in the balance of events, they should boast of regulating them exclusively; and that, despite the most fatal experience, they should attack, calumniate, and shamefully outrage, whosoever prefers saving them in his own way to ruining them in theirs.”

No subsequent letter of the Marshal informs us whether

this unflinching defence of the "Considérations," succeeded in dissipating the suspicions and discontent which Mallet's work had excited at the head quarters of the emigration. Most likely not : at any rate, these unwelcome truths did not long disturb hopes and illusions ever ready to spring again : people wanted miracles, and continued to hope for them.

CHAPTER XV.

1793.

Insurrections in the interior of France—Imprudent policy of the Governments of the Coalition regarding the insurgent departments and the Swiss Cantons—Representations on this subject addressed by Mallet to Lord Grenville.

IF our observer was justly rendered uneasy by the manœuvres of the generals of the Coalition, France, on its part, offered no more encouraging prospect. It is true that the rising in La Vendée and the south, combined with the movements of the Piedmontese army, should have effected a diversion of incalculable importance against the existence of the Convention; but the success of this plan was already compromised. The rising in La Vendée Mallet considered a movement of dubious result, partial, and, above all, exercising but little influence. According to him, the Vendean chiefs had no prospect of success, unless they gained possession of a port accessible to supplies: this was hopeless, as the event proved. They had raised the standard of a complete counter-revolution too early; and this error rallied around the Convention the wavering republicans and a

portion of the Constitutional army. Besides, the motive of religious zeal, though most effective in this part of the country, was lamentably inefficient throughout the remainder of France. The risings in the south, organized with more skill and prudence, possessed a far different importance. There the insurgents, belonging to every party except the Jacobin, had confined themselves to declaring war against the Convention and the clubs, in hopes of attaining afterwards to a stable and regular government. They worked towards this end by appropriating the uniform, laws, maxims, and means of their adversaries.

Mallet speaks as follows, in an historical sketch of these remarkable efforts to resist the Convention in the southern provinces :

“ They rallied the proprietors, and revived their influence ; they appealed to the universal interest entertained for lives and fortunes. In a word, they secured partisans before manifesting their true object :—a wise policy, the reverse of that heretofore pursued by the royalists.

“ Lyons, Marseilles, and Bordeaux, were the strongholds of the enterprise. These three correspondent cities carried with them the adjacent departments. Those of Saône-et-Loire, the Haute-Loire, the Ain, and the Jura, followed the leadership of Lyons : the southern portion of Dauphiné professed similar sentiments. Thus, forty leagues of frontier, contiguous to Savoy and Switzerland, had escaped the Convention. The department of Doubs, which borders on that of Jura, and constitutes a moiety of Franche-Comté, was beginning to show symptoms of the like views.

“ Three-fourths of Provence shared the opinions of Marseilles, and their conduct would have determined Avignon

and the county of Venaissin: the lower Languedoc took part in these movements.

“ Bordeaux drew after it two-thirds of Guienne, Périgord and part of Quercy.

“ On the right bank of the Rhône, between Lyons and Marseilles, are situated the departments of Ardèche and Lozère, where royalist insurrections have been almost incessant during the last three years. These departments, bordering on Rouergue, would have formed links in the line of communication reaching from Franche-Comté to Bordeaux.

“ The least certainty of support, and a few early successes, would have consolidated this coalition, and diminished one half the dominion of the Convention, in a space bounded by foreign limits, by the seas or important rivers, and able to preserve its independence longer, as well as easily to receive succour from without.

“ The towns and provinces commenced operations on an uniform plan: all the Jacobin clubs had been closed, their registers removed, their leaders imprisoned or put to death, the administrative authorities dismissed, and superseded by none but men of landed property. Royalists of reputation were invited, consulted, welcomed: the assignats of the Republic were proscribed or dishonoured, its deposits and receipts seized upon. An army was in process of organization in common, commanded by proprietors, for the most part royalist military men. Pecuniary subscriptions by the opulent towns sufficed for the requisite expenditure. The allied departments had just recalled their battalions of National Guards from the armies of La Vendée, of the Haut and Bas-Rhin. The majority of these battalions were on the return to their departments.”

Such was still the state of matters in the month of July, 1793 ; but, less than a month later, it had already become dubious ; and Mallet, who was kept perfectly well-informed of this critical position by reliable correspondence, ventured at the close of August to notify to Lord Grenville and the Cabinet of London, that in case these beginnings, already threatened, should miscarry, the Convention would at once find itself more secure than ever ; and that no time was to be lost, as nothing had yet been done to aid the rising in the south.

“To enable the insurgent towns and departments to maintain their efforts, three things were necessary : Firstly, that the adjoining foreign countries should be liberated from the influence, the authority, and the fear of the Convention, and that they should serve as a channel for the aid to be given to the frontier departments, at the same time that they should ensure them perfect security to the east and north : Secondly, that the army of the Alps, and that of Var, should be so engaged and pressed by the foreign armies, as to affect the deliverance of Lyons and Provence : Thirdly, that in lieu of bandying opinions with the insurgents, care should be taken to avoid prescribing to them any form of government, still more precepts of conduct, or any condition beyond that of persevering in their independence, and aiding to crush the Convention.

“These three points have been neglected, or nullified. Up to the middle of this month, Savoy has remained in the power of the Convention : its armies can at all times return thither. Geneva has been undone and overborne by its agent, and by revolutionary committees established under the protection of its soldiers. Finally, Switzerland.

abandoned by the powers, and hard pressed between the well-founded fear of the French armies, which blockade it, and the numberless seductions of the Ambassador Barthélemy—divided moreover in opinion—is under the necessity of acknowledging no other policy than that of excessive cautiousness towards France. The Piedmontese army's long sojourn beyond the Alps, has determined the siege of Lyons. Eighteen thousand men of the army of the Alps marched into that town on the 6th of August.

“Even prior to this, the Lyonnese, unaided by any movement from without, judging, by the general character of the war, that it did not affect the power of the revolution, and intimidated by portentous decrees, had, on the 26th of July, recognized the authority of the Convention, and accepted its last code, on condition that it should withdraw its mandates against the town and its defenders. The pride of the Convention admitted no compromise. Dubois de Crancé, its chief commissary in the army of the Alps, having bought the fidelity of the troops by an expenditure of five hundred thousand livres, hoped to meet with the same success at Lyons. He tried bribery, promises, threats; and divided, without overcoming, the first spirit of resistance. The departments of the Ain and Jura began to vacillate: the Marseillaise have retrograded. The committee of Geneva have become more daring, and delivered to the French fifteen thousand muskets from the arsenal. The partisans of the revolution throughout Switzerland have resumed their assurance, the chief part of the authorities their terrors, Barthélemy his intrigues, the impartial their tendency to weakness, the government their circumspection.”

The retaking of Savoy by the Sardinian troops had, beyond doubt, effected an improvement in this crisis; but it could not be concealed that, in all probability, Lyons would relent, if all the means necessary for sustaining its independence were not employed; and that the counting upon Switzerland to maintain the balance on the frontier afterwards, was a very gratuitous illusion. On this point, Mallet du Pan showed what a clumsy policy had been hitherto pursued towards the cantons.

“If, in the month of September, 1792, a general more enterprising than Montesquiou had commanded the army which, without striking a blow, had just taken possession of Savoy; if the hope of forcing the Swiss into an alliance had not counterbalanced the desire of the executive council of Paris to command an irruption into their territory, their line would have been inevitably broken on the south and west. Whilst Montesquiou was advancing in the south with twenty thousand men, a corps of ten thousand French, posted in the bishopric of Basle, was separated from Berne, solely by the last undefended range of the Jura, covering a space of from eight to ten leagues. A third corps of fifteen thousand men encamped near Huningue, could have forced Basle, and penetrated into Northern Switzerland. In this perilous position the Swiss learned the retreat of the allies in Champagne, the taking of Mayence, and all the disasters of the autumn. The Alps were impassable on account of snow, and no diversion was to be looked for from dismayed Piedmont. Germany and the Emperor held out no further hopes, seeing that scarcely ten thousand Austrians defended the right bank of the Rhine from the Swiss frontier, as far as Mannheim.

“This general abandonment, at so critical a moment, made a deep, natural, and lasting impression on the cantons: many accessory causes strengthened it. No overture, no communications had been made to the Helvetic Confederation by the allied powers: they had appeared to consider superfluous its accession to their projects. This silence was unfavourably construed, and the cantons agreed in thinking that, should they be so imprudent as to enter on a contest with France, they would be left to themselves, and that such a misfortune must at any price be guarded against.

“Far from becoming weakened, these sentiments only gained ground on account of certain palpable reasons, which escape those who possess only a superficial knowledge of Switzerland and its peculiar features. For instance, it was natural that the revolution, hated and feared in the aristocratic cantons, should prove less distasteful in those where the popular element was most prominent. Yet zeal for the Catholic religion, respect for the Court of Rome, unfailing, long-established attachment to the royal line of France, prevailed in the petty democracies of the interior. Moreover, the natural good sense of this pastoral nation led them to regard as deceptive the establishment of popular rule in France.

If other ideas bore sway in Zurich, Basle, and Appenzell, it is attributable to local causes only. These three republics have considerable commercial relations with France: they are dependent on it for the transit of their merchandize, they are interested in its public funds; intercourse between their inhabitants and the French is more habitual. Basle, too, had been especially open to the influence of fear.

ever since the invasion of Porentruy; the pitching of a French camp near Huningue, and the erection of batteries directed against Basle itself to obstruct the passage of the Imperialists. A platoon of bewildered Austrians, in the Brisgaw, was by no means calculated to reassure a canton at that time under the dominion of a chancellor deeply imbued with French extravagances. At Zurich, the government, rendered insecure by unruly citizens and not daring to display a bias against the exercise of popular sovereignty in France, has preserved neither moderation nor dignity; nevertheless, a considerable minority and almost the whole army profess other opinions. The men of letters, more numerous at Zurich than at Basle, and the philanthropic economists plentifully found in this canton, have also swelled the list in favour of Paris doctrines.

“ But jealousy concerning Berne, fomented by the Ambassador Barthélemy, and the desire of embarrassing this canton, at once the first in power and estimation, and the most worthy of this eminence, rendered fruitful all other causes, while inducing them with noxious activity.

“ The course pursued by Berne during these four years is too generally known to need recapitulation. Actuated by a spirit of opposition, Zurich and Basle piqued themselves on an opposite line of action; thus, the more firmness and dignity were displayed by the canton of Berne, the more did the two others yield and temporize. Several times Berne was compelled to remonstrate with them—to their mortification, as they could not but submit.

“ The principal credit was at Berne, in the hands of M. Steiguer, a most consummate statesman, possessed of an intellect at once steadfast, acute, and en-

larged, an adept in the guidance of other men's minds, and no less versed in foreign policy than in that of the Helvetic union.* This magistrate was reputed to favour an indirect adhesion to the projects of other powers. He had originally started and rendered prevalent the plan for an armed neutrality, in virtue of which the French were to be required and compelled to evacuate Porentruy. Barthélemy's intrigues, libels, and jealousy, all turned against M. Steguier. These attacks scarcely injured him: but not even his influence could withstand the events of last autumn; they baffled his foresight and his calculations. The democrats of the country, the alarmed, the indifferent, ever borne along by the noisy current, above all, his rivals in influence, united against him. The public question at once became personal and of a party. The majority of the councils of Berne sided with the majority of the councils of Zurich and Basle. M. Steguier saw no alternative but to lower his principles and bow to circumstances.

"The chiefs of the majority allied themselves more and more with the embassy of France, which spared no pains to augment the number of its adherents. The French minister redoubled his attentions: he wrote the most amiable letters to the Zurich directory. It was promised

* Under Louis XV., M. de Vergennes visited Switzerland to negotiate a treaty with the Confederation. Among the deputies sent on behalf of the diet to Soleure, was Steiguer. One day Madame de Vergennes asked an old landamman of Uri, who had the honour of playing at cards with her, who this M. Steiguer, of Berne might be. "Madame," replied the old mountaineer, "M. Steiguer is the trump of our game."

that the neutrality of Munsterthal (a valley of the canton of Berne, annexed to the bishopric of Basle) should be acknowledged; passions were soothed, vanity was flattered, fear was reassured, cupidity awakened. The arrears of the regiments expelled the French service, were liquidated either in specie, or in assignats of equivalent value; retiring pensions were promised; and thus two thousand patrician families were interested in the fate of the French Republic. The Committee of Public Safety at Paris decreed that the supplies of salt due, should be consigned to such members of the Helvetic corporation as would acknowledge the ambassador of the Republic. Finally, they even went so far as to pay the Swiss, most connected with the French public funds, their interest in full, with an additional sum to indemnify them for the loss incurred by holding assignats. And what did the powers oppose to this active, continuous policy, carried on by agents well versed in the knowledge of the country? *Nothing!*

“After two years of forgetfulness, the Court of Vienna, at the end of February last, sent Baron de Buolz, ex-chargé d'affaires at the Hague, to Switzerland. This minister arrived too late, when jealousy of the Emperor had already taken deep root, and on the morrow of the very day when, on the demand of Zurich, the majority resolved at Berne on the legitimization of the French ambassador.

“Neither the minister of the Court of Berlin, nor he of London, nor of Madrid, took any steps whatever either in public or private. In this general lethargy, the Cabinet of Turin alone acted, but unsuccessfully; because, in its isolation, it lacked the necessary means, and also was baffled by circumstances.

“The effects corresponded with the different causes we have just analysed. The well-intentioned minority fell more and more into discredit. The tardy, imperfect, and ill-combined action of foreign courts has missed its aim.

“The invasion of Poland also contributed to disgust men’s minds, to furnish an all-powerful weapon to the partisans of the French Republic, and to remove the general will still further from all friendly relations with the enemy.

“War is what all the world—people and governments alike—unite in fearing. What good can be looked for from negotiations and efforts which tend to this? How strange to attempt settling a fastidious nation by going against the general feeling at the very outset! Surely, the partisans of such policy never duly weighed the effects which it would produce, or the civil and military constitution of the cantons. We may venture to predict that the Swiss will never be unanimous in their consent to an armed rupture with France; and if any cantons were to assume the right of dispensing with such unanimity, they would risk breaking the Helvetic Union and entailing a civil war.

“We are mistaken, when we picture to ourselves the modern Swiss as resembling their ancestors, whose sole occupation was war. In our day they are graziers, agriculturists, merchants, patricians, journalists, and magistrates, all men of property, particularly those who live in the country, and consequently all interested in the preservation of peace. No large number of these can be placed in arms, without detriment to their necessary work; a standing army cannot be set on foot without introducing disorder into the public and private economy of the country;

high pay alone will content men accustomed to domestic ease, and not soldiers by profession. Such men, brave and hardy, will form an excellent militia for the defence of their own firesides, because to this they are prompted by instinct, by tangible interests, by a sense of duty which pervades their whole mind, and because this kind of service subjects them to discipline without separating them from their homes and families. But none of these motives can be brought to bear on foreign and offensive wars. From such wars, therefore, the people of the present day will invariably shrink.

“The Governments of the Cantons could not do violence to this aversion without risking internal peace. I dare assert that it is doubtful whether they would be obeyed. It is no such easy matter to rule a nation of rustics, when, as in this case, they read the newspapers: a nation which abhors the French, but which has been taught by experience that their resistance is not a thing to be despised. On every account, therefore, we must reject the thought of dragging the Helvetic body into an offensive rupture with France. We must draw upon Switzerland for such advantages as are attainable and spring naturally from its position; not attempt to force its position, in order to bring from it uncertain advantages.

“In a word, an armed and well-appointed neutrality will be productive of more benefit than war; but it would be a great mistake to suppose that negotiations will ever lead to these results without exacting sacrifices, without requiring the exercise of activity, patience, and talent.

“The first indispensable condition is good faith. The

Swiss will not be deceived twice; indeed they will never be deceived at all. They are possessed of that mistrust which is necessary to the well-being of secondary powers; they dread the House of Austria: the invasion of Poland, and the unfathomable designs of the combined courts, have put the various parties on their guard. We must contrive to handle them all with delicacy, to conciliate them instead of labouring to sacrifice one to another, and so manage affairs that they shall, in their natural course, establish the superiority of well-intentioned persons. There are such in every canton; we must make ourselves acquainted with them, gain their confidence, and follow their counsels, not ourselves seek to counsel them."

This report had also been sent to Lord Elgin, Minister Plenipotentiary from the Court of London to the Netherlands, whom Mallet du Pan frequently saw at Brussels. At the time he received it, he was busily engaged in passing and repassing from one seat of head-quarters to another, to revive the energies of the war-councils of the coalition; and, therefore, deferred his reply until after his return from London, where he had had the opportunity of judging of the effect produced by the "*Considérations*" and the Report.

LETTER FROM LORD ELGIN TO MALLET DU PAN.

"I have discussed your pamphlet with all the ministers; but the limits of a letter will not admit of my conveying to you any adequate idea of the effect it has produced, and the approbation it has elicited. The declaration we

have just issued renders it less needful that I should detail opinions expressed *vivâ voce*. I had, as a matter of course, expected this coincidence of ideas and views of the French Revolution. I must however confess, that from such a man as Mr. Burke, whose conduct has differed from yours, whose imagination is more lively, and whose principles, to judge from appearances, more nearly approach to those of the *ancien régime*, I did not look for the like favourable judgment of your report. But I was entirely mistaken ; for, with his ordinary force of language, Mr. Burke told me that it was, unquestionably, the best thing written on the revolution ; and that, with some unimportant exceptions, he found in it every opinion he had ever entertained on the subject. He spoke of it long, and truly with enthusiasm. As regards the report, the fear I expressed to you at the time has been realized, for Lord Grenville and Mr. Pitt alone had read it : on them it had made a due impression. The views, the facts, the arguments struck them, I venture to think, to some purpose ; and although the sequel is not known to me, I have no doubt you will recognize it shortly. For my part, I have had copies printed for other members of the ministry ; and when I am in possession of their opinions I will not fail to communicate them to you."

The result of this campaign was an overwhelming blow to Mallet. Montlosier, no less discouraged, but always of an active imagination, had talked of founding an agricultural colony in the Crimea ; and proposed to Mallet that he should share in the undertaking. The health of the latter did not allow him to engage in such projects. There was

no more talk of young English noblemen, whom it had been proposed to confide to Mallet. Notwithstanding the urgency of Malouet, who desired to keep him at Brussels, where he had himself arrived, he left for Switzerland, and came to settle in Berne, where his family awaited him. Once reunited to them, he would not hear of a fresh separation.

CHAPTER XVI.

1794.

Historical and political report drawn up for Lord Elgin—On the character of the French Revolution and its successive aspects—The means employed to oppose it—Its military and financial resources—State of public opinion in France—Debates in the English Parliament.

MALLET would have wished to have left behind him, on quitting Brussels, the load of painful thoughts which troubled him unceasingly ; but it was beyond his power to free himself from anxieties which everything justified. In fact, the year 1793 was about to complete its terrible course as it had begun, dark and sanguinary, the revolution continuing as powerful as ever, and more threatening. What plan would the powers adopt for the coming campaign? Would the coalition, in lieu of gaining strength, allow itself to fall to pieces under the influence of individual interest, the suggestions of self-confident vanity, old state jealousies, the recriminations invariably arising from ill-success in every coalition? Would the powers, out of sheer weariness, negotiate with the revolution, or adopt its tactics by entrusting the command of the armies to others? The latter of these alternatives appeared to Mallet as deplorable as the

former. On the 20th of November, 1793, he addressed, spontaneously, to Lord Elgin and M. de Mercy, for their respective States—and, as if to respond to the wish of the former who had requested continuous communications from him—a paper, in which he undisguisedly showed that the powers considered the war from a point of view which could not but be disadvantageous to them, and that an urgent necessity existed to take measures and display resources of an extraordinary character, in order to combat with success a revolution so extraordinary as that of France. The subject-matter of this paper is the same as that of the “*Considérations* ;” but, although written on a plan of less extension, its style is more close and terse. The earlier portion is an analysis of the revolution, and its motive causes, and deserves the attention of politicians for the originality of its views. The piece deserves to be known, and we reproduce it here in full :

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND
ITS SUCCESSIVE ASPECTS.

“ It is a mistake to imagine that the French Revolution derives its origin, as is commonly said, from the spirit of ‘philosophy,’ depravity and irreligion, which had long reigned in France. It is an equally grave error to attribute it to such or such a form of representation in the States-General; and it would be a yet greater delusion to suppose that a sovereign, who for a time seemed a puppet in the hands of a faction, to facilitate insurrection, was its primary or chief agent.

“ The ill-regulated spirit of philosophy, like the ill-

regulated spirit of religion—like the dogmatic spirit, generally, of whatever kind—avails or possesses itself of revolutions, but does not create them. Frederick the Great and Voltaire gave in public, at Berlin, lessons of impiety, which occasioned no more sedition there than the scandalous suppers of the Regent caused at Paris. Under Louis XV., the whole Court was made up of free-thinkers, and never was a more feeble and common-place monarch more scrupulously served. Under Louis XIV., Corneille gave utterance to his republican sentiments on the stage; and the great characteristics of the republic of Rome made no more impression than that of the republic of Plato. In a word, for centuries, not only on the stage, but in every college, in every university, and in every academy of France, of England, of Germany, and of all Europe, the memory and the imagination of youth dwelt on nothing but the noblest features of the ancient republics. All *that* did not cause, and never will cause, a revolution.

“A revolution is essentially a dislocation of power, taking place of necessity, whenever the traditionary power has lost strength to protect the common weal, or courage to protect itself.

“In France; from the moment when the sovereign was forced to convoke the States-General; from the moment when the King, who had ruled, administered, reigned alone till that time, solemnly declared that he stood in need of a power other than his own, and revived an ancient institution, forgotten, abolished for two centuries, there took place a dislocation of power, and consequently a revolution. This revolution, it will be seen, was not the effect of such or such a conspiracy, such or such a plan.

it was owing to the state of disorder in which the finances then were, to the malversations of the ministers to whom their care had been confided, to the violent or ill-digested measures adopted by other ministers to repair them, to the various successive conflicts which arose, by these means, between the sovereign and the great bodies of the State; in a word, to whatever, whether of old or recent occurrence, whether directly or indirectly, necessitated the disastrous innovation of the States-General. Thus, irrespectively of the teachings of philosophy, of the double representation of the third estate, and the intrigues of the Duke of Orleans, there would always have been a revolution in France. The clergy, the nobility, and the third estate—supposing them to have agreed in the States-General—would have attempted none the less to seize on the royal authority; and so certain is this, that almost all writers contemplated a representative government, permanent or periodical, to which they attributed, not only the right of imposing taxes but, the rights also of administration and legislation, which had always appertained to the King.

“Power, once slipped out of the King’s hands, it was evidently a struggle as to who should seize upon it. The clergy and the nobility, bodies of power in past times, but almost annihilated in modern days, did indeed receive a considerable portion of it; but they were not strong enough to keep it. This portion of power first met with a check, while in their hands, by the decision of the councils, which ordained the double representation of the third estate: it escaped them afterwards almost entirely, by the meeting of the orders in common, which

caused a second dislocation of power—that is to say, the revolution of the 14th of July.

“From that period to the present moment, we count three other revolutions also; viz. the revolution of the 16th of October, whose object was to get the King into the hands of the city of Paris and to deprive him of the shadow of power which was supposed to have been left him; secondly, the revolution of the 10th of August, whose object was to transfer to the hands of the Republicans the new power acquired by the Constitutionals; finally, the revolution of the 31st of May, whose object was to transfer once again to the hands of the sans-culottes the power acquired by the Girondist faction.

“Thus it appears, that the first revolution—that of the States-General—was a revolution accomplished on behalf of the whole nation, minus the King; that the second—that of the 14th of July—was a revolution on behalf of the whole nation, minus the King, the nobility, and the clergy; that the third—that of the 16th of October—was but a supplement to the one preceding; that the fourth—that of the 10th of August—was a revolution on behalf of the whole nation, minus the King, the nobility and clergy, and those who had displaced them; and that the fifth—that of the 31st of May—was a revolution on behalf of the nation, minus every one possessing property.

“In order to understand how it is that the French Revolution has taken this singular course, it must be observed, that, whereas other revolutions are got up by such or such a party, such or such a chief, the French Revolution, on the contrary, and its various phases, have been got up by the mass of the people. It was the

people, as is well known, who caused the revolution of the States-General, exacting its recompense in the abrogation of pecuniary privileges, which caused the revolution of the 14th of July, exacting its recompense in the suppression of tithes, *corvées*, and a portion of the feudal dues—that is to say, on the night of the 4th of August; which caused the revolution of the 10th of October, exacting its recompense in the confiscation of the goods of the clergy—that is to say, in the day of the 2nd of December; which caused the revolution of the 6th of August, exacting its recompense in the decree of suppression of the last remnant of seignorial rights; which finally caused the revolution of the 31st of May, receiving in payment the first of the agrarian laws—that is to say, the decree of taxation.

“Now, power once played by a regular method into the hands of the people, whether by the institution of the national guard, which establishes it as a fact, or by the dogma of the popular sovereignty, which established it as a right, it was quite natural that there the power should remain; and thus, fallen from the throne, and escaping constantly from various hands too weak to hold it, it should descend, from declension to declension, into those of the multitude. And indeed it was not till this period that the meaning of the word “people” began to be definite. At first, the Parliaments, in the fervour of their resistance to royal authority also invoked the rights of the people. The word then meant the nobles, the magistrates—all classes of citizens; and the King very sensibly complained of the attempt “to separate him from his people.” That caused the revolution of the States General.

“At the second revolution, on the contrary, the factions were compelled to lay it down, according to the views of Abbé Sieyès, that the nobility, the clergy, and the great State dignitaries, were not the people; that this word could only be applied to the Third Estate:—and then commenced the reign of bankers and lawyers.

“At the time of the revolution of the 10th August, the founders of the republic were very anxious to count property and proprietors as something: but the dissentients pointed out that this class of society was not the people, any more than the dignitaries, the nobility, and the clergy. They laid it down that there was no “people” in the state, except the hungry, the indigent, the *sans culottes*—and that these were sovereign. Thenceforward, the sense of this word “people,” being applied to the most numerous and the strongest, became restricted by little and little to the lowest grade of society.

“Thus it is, that the French revolution has assumed the singular character which distinguishes it from all other revolutions throughout the world. We have seen what it has been—what it is: we have only to determine what it may become.

“In order to make some probable conjecture on this point, we must take the revolution at the present moment, that is, at the time when the dislocation of power is consummated. Now, it is an invariable maxim, that the dislocation of power, once consummated, leads inevitably to the dislocation of property. Nothing can hinder him who has power from having bread as well; and the effectual possession of equality of rights is valuable for the indigent only as implying equality of comforts. We

must, accordingly be convinced, that the total dissolution of property which the Convention has for a while opposed, is a necessary consequence of its position, and that an irresistible movement will drag it to this consummation, more or less rapidly, according to circumstances.

“We need only, to have positive data on this subject, remember the principles professed a year back, by a deputation sent to the Assembly by the Gard Department, and which expressly demanded that a sum of two hundred and fifty millions should be assigned as an indemnity to the cultivator of the grain, which it styled national property. ‘This alarming sum of two hundred and fifty millions,’ added the deputation, ‘is simply a supposititious advance made by the State, placing at its disposal real and purely national riches, *which do not belong as property to any single member of the social body, any more than the pernicious metals introduced into the currency.*’

“We need only also remember a speech of Robespierre at the same time : ‘The first of rights,’ said he, ‘is that of existing ; the first social law is that which guarantees to every member of society the means of existing : all others are subordinate to that. It is, firstly, in order to live that property exists : it is not true that property can ever be in opposition to subsistence, which is sacred as life itself. The only thing necessary to preserve it is a property common to society at large : the excess alone is individual property, resignable to the interests of commerce.’

“Thus began to be hatched, at this period, the dogma of equality of property, whose germ the revolution had already warmed. These dogmas reappeared subsequently with prominence in all those decrees of the Assembly whose

object it is to regulate the means of subsistence of the *sans-culottes* ; especially in the famous law of taxation, as well as in the preparatory defamation of proprietors, pointed out by anticipation to the hatred of the people, by the names of forestallers or "*muscadins*," as the nobles and the priests had been by the names of aristocrats and "*calotins*."

"Such has been hitherto the course of the French revolution ; such its unvarying character. Its future development must be the consequence of this. The dislocation of power is achieved, the dislocation of property has already commenced ; it will inevitably be consummated, whatever new dissensions may arise in the dominant faction."

OF THE MEANS THAT HAVE BEEN EMPLOYED TO COMBAT THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

"Attempts have been made repeatedly from within, as well as from without, antagonistic to the Revolution ; King, nobles, constitutionalists, Girondists, sought to arrest its course, but were successively carried away by it. From without, foreign potentates and the emigrant party used their endeavours, but with the like want of success.

"It would carry us into details foreign to this narrative, were we to endeavour to explain how such continued assaults proved fruitless ; it is, however, deserving of note, that, as the French Revolution owed its origin to a victory, and was consolidated by further victories, it was by a course of victories that its internal enemies should have sought to arrest its progress ; and, in consequence, their duty was to stir up a civil war—a civil war, the only resource left to

the French, which, however, could alone be kindled by well balancing the passions and interests concerned. It is a great error to suppose that it was dependent on the double representation of the Third Estate, on the union of classes, or on any other similar combination.

“One fact is indisputable ; that, from the moment the King consented to place himself in the hands of the States-General, he could not withdraw, without, as it were, entering into a treaty with the nation, by which he would necessarily be abridged of a portion of his power. His council was perfectly aware of this dilemma, and this probably gave rise to the Royal declaration of the 23d of June, 1789. It would, doubtless, have been desirable that this document should have been more carefully elaborated ; but, the step once taken, it should have been boldly supported by the fullest display of power ; and I am of opinion that, if a high-toned and strenuous resistance had then been offered, it would have been attended with complete success.

“The timid attempts that took place afterwards could not accomplish their object. The nobility and clergy seemed to rally round the King as their prop ; the factious party was convinced that Royalty was yet a stronghold : they did their best to seize it, dismantled as it was ; such was the aim kept in view by the revolutionists, on the 6th of October. The King, once more in the power of the factious, himself became a tool of the revolution, and, virtually defeating all efforts made to save him, civil war became less and less attainable.

“I cannot say whether the federation of July, 1790, or the partial federation which preceded this, or the decree affecting religion, might have proved adequate incentives ;

I cannot determine whether the journey to Montmédy, had it been as fortunate as was anticipated, would have secured a favourable result ; I cannot even decide whether, supposing the King to have had sufficient courage to hazard comprehensive measures, he would have been firm enough to carry them out with that resolution and persistence, which are so requisite to insure success. This unhappy Prince placed continually, in these revolutionary times, between the dangers of rashness, which were great, and the dangers of prudence, greater still, could never make up his mind to any course of action not in accordance with the virtues of meekness, good nature, and easy compliance. Courageous in hazarding his own life, timid as a child when that of his subjects or his friends was at stake, he was possessed of that heroism of resignation which is allied to the heroism of goodness. Remembering, however, what fatal results were entailed on him by this goodness, let us confess that we have no right to reproach him for it.

“ In regard to the nobles, I know not whether in union with the King, they might not have effected something ; but I am quite certain that without him they could do nothing. There have been persons who, dazzled by the splendour of aristocratic prowess in times passed, would have reminded them of the doings of the nobility of Rome and of the feudal ages ; but they forgot in making the comparison, that at Rome, where the ancient institution of patrons and clients prevailed, when a man of rank rose in opposition to any given law or any innovation, he necessarily imparted a great impulse, because together with himself he set in motion an immense body of clients and friends. During the feudal government, too, when a prince of the blood, or even a

private gentleman raised his standard against the incursions of injustice, he appeared in the battle-field with all his feudal retainers, who never abandoned him. On the contrary, during the revolution, as all feudal power and influence were completely at an end, it is evident that a prince of the blood, a general, a noble, had nothing to depend upon but his own individual self in any species of confederation; and that as, on the other hand, the people had been endowed by the Assembly with the spoils of the aristocracy, they were induced to regard gentlemen only in the light of enemies, and were much more inclined to oppose than to favour their attempts.

“The constitutionalists who might have derived great advantage from the circumstance of the revision, and been so benefited by the victory over the Jacobin club in the Champ de Mars, had to repent of their timid circumspection, when they witnessed the almost total dissolution of their party: having failed to defend the King on the 20th of June, they shared in his proscription on the 10th of August.

“The emigrants, on the other hand, who ought to have directed their efforts to the south, where they possessed strongholds and partisans, preferred taking their way towards the north, where they had neither. They might have leagued with the constitutionalists, who still had at their disposal all the posts of the army, of the departments, of the districts, and of the national guards, and who might have yielded up one of the fortresses. A sentiment of delicacy, doubtless very laudable, opposed a course of policy which would have been much more to the purpose; and the most inviting opening for a civil war was lost. The impulse that was afterwards given to

emigration; the exaggerated principles that the exiles were led to profess; the ridiculous vanity which separated the nobles and the middle classes, and prevented the confederation of provinces; that malevolent spirit which prevailed on them to repress tardy remorse and repentance; the appalling instances of injustice which were the natural result—all concurred to deprive the emigrants of that support and success which they looked for in the interior, and would have done so, even had not the inadequacy of the means at their command put in a proportionably stronger light the astounding presumption of their pretensions.

“It remains for me to speak of the foreign powers; here matters change their aspect entirely. Tacitus says, that when minds were once turned at Rome towards civil war, people cared no longer for foreign wars: *conversis ad civile bellum animis, externa sine cura habebantur*. When minds are turned towards foreign war, all the germs of civil dissension disappear. Foreign war and civil war are, therefore, naturally antagonistic. The powers ought to have counted on this; they ought to have foreseen that, so soon as they showed themselves, an extraordinary display of strength would take place, of which no sign yet existed. Their want of foresight on this point, as well as on some other points of the revolution, has been very disastrous. For example: as soon as the National Assembly had created four hundred millions of currency in assignats on the so-called national lands, and this first issue had been followed almost immediately by a second of eight hundred millions it would have seemed that the success of such an experiment must begin to alarm Europe. This alarm should have augmented when

three or four millions of National Guards were seen to be raised and completely organized, although their institution had seemed to appertain to a moment of terror, and to be naturally transitory like it. But if the concurrence of these two measures, carried out with a success utterly unexpected, was somewhat terrifying, the decree of the Constituent Assembly, ordering the levying of one hundred and fifty thousand men on a frontier bristling with fortresses, close to a rich country, open on all sides, defended with scarcely fifty thousand soldiers, and ready for revolution, should have redoubled the anxiety, and prescribed imperiously and with all possible haste, adequate measures of defence. Yet cabinets, accustomed to watch with uneasiness the departure of a frigate or the movements of some battalions, saw no ground of fear in all these events. Amid the chaos and difficulties which convulsed France, they probably could not believe in the possibility of war; yet war was determined by this very chaos and these difficulties. For those who above all things dreaded civil war, stood in need of foreign war to prevent it: they needed terror above all.

“In fact, it has never been sufficiently understood that terror is a necessary agent in every revolution. It is the terror experienced by the factious which cements their union; it is the terror they spread which cements their power. Thus is a revolution brought about: thus did the leaders of the French revolution succeed in consolidating it, by constantly employing the means of terror which were in their hands. Thus, when all the tales of brigands, conspiracies, plots to blow up Paris, all invented with a view of exaggerating distrust everywhere, and

pushing all measures to extremity, had been exhausted, when the constitution was completed, and the emigration of aristocrats from the realm had done away with all pretext for suspecting conspiracies, or dreading the assemblage of the disaffected, it is evident that divisions would have sprung up, and thenceforward that the bond of union which had kept together the various parties of the revolution would have begun to fail.

“ The declaration of war against the foreign powers was therefore, manifestly, a revolutionary measure. Its object was to concentrate all power in the hands of the legislative body, to strip the King of his authority, and bring on the Republic. It might, indeed, have been foreseen that peace could be of no long duration with a people which openly professed regicide doctrines, and whose revolutionary principles undisguisedly aspired to the conquest of all Europe : measures should consequently have been taken forthwith to resist, or rather to destroy it. The success of the first day of Mons, the advantages that should have followed it, if sustained by an offensive army of a hundred thousand men marching immediately on France, must excite regret for the opposite course that has been pursued.”

Mallet shows, in continuation, that war once declared, there were but two courses open to the allied powers ; either to enter France by the first breach, and thence march direct on Paris ; or to make sure of the frontiers in the first instance by taking the fortresses. The writer discusses the merit of these two plans, adopted successively by the Duke of Brunswick in the first campaign, and by the Prince of Coburg in the second. He shows by what faults of execution both plans failed. Regarding the latter

campaign, he reproaches the Coalition with the following errors :

“ The temporizing plan of the Prince of Coburg adopted this year, was less daring ; with its drawbacks, it possessed also advantages. The drawback consisted in its allowing the hostile levies to form and become inured to war ; the advantage was that of leaving in the interior of the state a degree of repose well adapted to the formation of factions and the excitation of the various parties. The advantage of this plan was then, that it fostered the development of internal dissensions, and the utmost should have been made of that advantage. Now, what was done to second the departmental movement of Calvados and the Gironde, annihilated almost as soon as begun ; the movement of La Vendée, so long abandoned to all the hazards of unaided war ; the revolt of the city of Lyons, and that of Marseilles, which might have exercised so great an influence in favour of the counter-revolution ? Some persons affirm, that had thirty thousand men passed the Alps, they might have reached Geneva, and made sure of it, and thence penetrated as far as Lyons. I can offer no opinion on this point ; but I do know that, after employing an army and considerable time in retaking Mayence, which might have been protected by the simplest foresight, there was small profit in relieving the army which was shut up in it, so as to give the Convention the means of crushing La Vendée. I know too, that in taking Valenciennes, the powers did not even reflect that by releasing the garrison there, they gave the Convention a terrible opportunity of stifling the important resistance of Lyons — yet with a little consideration, it would have been

evident that the getting rid apparently of two armies by sending them against our own best and surest allies, was a bad calculation of advantages. We may be quite sure that the submission of Lyons, Calvados, Marseilles, and Bordeaux, were events more disastrous for the powers in the course of the year, than would have been the loss of Valenciennes, Mayence, and all Belgium. . . .

“Regarding Toulon, more prudence was displayed; I will even add that, in some political respects, the conduct of the allies was laudable; but, considered as counter-revolutionary, I cannot but find it still defective. The French and English generals talked a great deal and talked exceedingly well, but possibly what they ought to have done was to make the inhabitants of Toulon speak. All Europe would rejoice to see the efforts and activity of a small population armed against its tyrants, and availing itself of the armed assistance of great powers only as a means in some sort accessory and precarious. Such is the population which the powers should incessantly point out and appeal to: instead of that they point to themselves, and leave the other to be forgotten. La Vendée performed prodigies; but we may be sure it would have done nothing if a foreign general, making proclamations in its name, had from the beginning taken into his own hands the administration and chief direction of its affairs. I venture to predict that such conduct will stifle all sort of emulation in the towns of the south. I dare say they will submit to it; but we may be sure that they will not supply any impulsive and energetic action in a movement which will not be their own.

“Thus,” says Mallet, “we return to our present situation

the powers adopted last year the plan of vigour, without taking the political and military precautions which could have conferred success upon them. This year they have adopted the plan of prudence, without profiting by the advantages arising from it. Last year, they miscalculated the strong point of the French Revolution ; this year, they have miscalculated its weak point. The errors of last year were perhaps errors of ordinary policy ; the errors of this year have been errors of counter-revolutionary policy. In this state of things, (let us not disguise the fact), the French Revolution has reached the culminating point of its power ; next year, all that the powers will be able to do by redoubling their efforts will be to fight it on equal terms. And then let them beware, especially of their own lassitude. I do not question that their league is perfectly in unison ; but I know by how many interests, how many fragile threads, this league is held together ; and that the example of the sincerity, constancy, and durability of such an association would be, perhaps, as marvellous a fact in history as that of the French Revolution."

The better to establish the necessity of employing extraordinary means against the French Revolution, Mallet proceeds to compare the forces of the revolution with those of the powers—that is to say, the finances, the armies, and the internal vigour of government in the former, with the same resources in the latter. According to him, the pecuniary means of France are unequalled, since she possesses in paper a mine she works incessantly ; and Mallet affirms, on demonstration, that he sees no present hope whatever of the depreciation of the paper-currency. This was open rupture with the favourite lobby

of the English Cabinet. Pitt had persuaded himself that the Republic, soon exhausted in its resources, could not hold out against two campaigns. As to the military forces, Mallet declares with equal frankness that he cannot perceive any advantage on the side of the allied powers.

“Their armies possess more *sang-froid*, more method; the French have more ardour and daring. We should note that in the course of this war, they have fallen into very few mistakes; I do not see that they have neglected any good position, missed any favourable chance of attack; and, when it is known that Dumouriez’s army was on the point of beating the Austrians at Nerwinde, when the two positive advantages of Dunkirk and Maubeuge are remembered, together with the details of numberless bloody and obstinate conflicts which they have always been the first to seek and engage in, we are warranted in not partaking the general contempt of the effects of these musters. Finally, when we reflect that these armies, often vanquished, but sometimes also victorious, have become in some sort indestructible by the ease of immediately recruiting and supplying them—while it is only with the greatest difficulty that the allied armies can repair their losses—we recal to mind the reasoning of Fabius: ‘Hannibal,’ he said, ‘kills five hundred Romans; but if he loses two hundred, whom he must replace from Carthage—a little time longer, and he will be destroyed.’ Fabius reasoned well.”

The disturbances in the interior of France, far from enfeebling the government, are, according to Mallet, a further element of its strength.—

Mallet complies with the request of the French nation, since

exist amid so much violence and crime ; but this is because they have not sufficiently consulted the history of nations. Let us not be deceived.

“Acts of atrocity are the transitory, but inevitable, course of a nation which has displaced all the old powers, all the old institutions, and which is in need of violence in order to overcome the resistance it meets with, and of terror to anticipate the resistance it dreads. Thus, all France being, so to speak, in a state of siege, and fronting a multitude of intestine divisions which menace her, what matters it to the chiefs who guide her that they are barbarous, provided they are prudent ? Now, it is a grand and terrible prudential measure to have dared to place themselves above all forms, and to have employed in regard to their whole territory the measures practised in a ship in peril, or a besieged town. And, besides, who could rise up against these excesses ? They scarcely ever affect the *Sans-culottes* : generally, indeed, they aim to profit them ; and, as regards other classes of society, if we reflect that, from the first member of the Committee of Public Safety to the last member of the Convention, from the first member of the department to the last justice of the peace, from the general of the army to the last subaltern, all existing power has emanated from the revolution, and is consequently framed to protect it—we shall no longer be surprised at this unanimous concert between men bound together by want and crime. How should there be any to rise up against excesses or atrocities which have become necessary for their own preservation ? They shed human blood in self-defence, as man has accustomed himself from childhood to shed the blood of animals for his subsistence.”

Mallet proceeds to dispose of the question as to what reliance might be placed on opinion in France :—

“I must say that this ground of hope has no reality ; for opinion, in times of revolution, always sides with him who has the upper hand. It is a vast spectacle, the majority of whose features are shrouded in shadow. At the first event unfavourable to the ruling party, the salient features are overclouded, and those which are in shadow begin to assume colour : but, if new successes efface this reverse, the features which had assumed colour vanish, and those which had been clouded re-appear with augmented brilliancy. Besides, as I have said elsewhere, in matters of revolution it is not enough to have an opinion ; one must also have a will strong in this opinion, and in the courage of its purpose. Now, when the difficulty or the impossibility of success is evident on all sides, and when a system of terrorism overawes every will and crushes all courage, what reliance is to be placed on opinion ?”*

* One of Mallet’s occasional correspondents, a faithful observer and a man of good sense, described thus, some time after the fall of Robespierre, this paralysis of opinion, this insensibility of the Parisian mob in view of the daily scenes of the reign of terror.

“Under Robespierre every one thought himself happy in not being in prison. The people calculated the number of prisoners, or of the inhabitants of the city, who, according to the system of depopulation, were likely to perish ; and every one hoped he would not be himself included among these, whether by means of some unexpected revolution, or because his turn would come later ; and I can assure you, without exaggeration, that in this manner the Committee of Public Safety might have rid itself of all the men in easy circumstances in France, one after the other, without the least opposi-

“Finally, war was itself an advantage to France. It is by means of war they have had time and a pretext to create and organize a vast internal force; by means of war that they now dispose arbitrarily of the persons, the life, the property of citizens; and now that they have

tion. Nero and Caligula had not yet made such an experiment on the human race; how then was it possible to try it on a nation full of *amour-propre* and possessed of daring and courage? And how is it no son was found to avenge his father, either at Paris or at Lyons, while swords were drawn for a wench or a hasty word?

“People were so accustomed to see twenties and forties taken to the scaffold, that they had ceased to pay attention to it—they merely asked the names. I did not trace in the countenance of the Parisians that sorrow, that consternation, which every feeling heart should have experienced at the sight of such horrible butchery: the populace thought and said generally that it was necessary to kill the aristocrats, and they would be quiet afterwards. The first person I saw pass on the tumbril was Charlotte Corday; and the first man I saw guillotined was the Duke of Orleans; and I confess a savage feeling came over me. He was cool and indifferent, and the people were not sparing in hisses. I treated myself similarly to Brissot, Danton, and Robespierre. A spirit of curiosity took me also to the palace to see the exit of poor Linguet; he was perfectly tranquil, without any symptom of regret or dejection. The unfortunate Marshal de Mouchy, his wife, Victor de Broglie, M. de St. Priest’s brother, and others of less note, were there at the same time.” The same correspondent, in concluding, makes an expressive observation: “I am forced to break off. I am going to dine with Thomas (a *nom de guerre*), in the house where dined of old a Rayneval, a Jurien, a Mirabeau, a Rabaut, a Garat; where dined subsequently a Guadet, a Gensonné, a Roland, a Barrère, a Prieur de la Marne, and now a Tallien, a Fréron, a Carletti. You see, citizen, that our morality accommodates itself to everything, and I believe that is its ban.”

found the means of getting a hundred thousand men into marching order, the same means will serve for three hundred thousand, or even a million. Now that they have found the means of ensuring subsistence by force, the same means last for ever, and are applicable on all occasions. Urgent necessity, real or pretended, becomes the first law of action: a military dictatorship arises from the sole force of circumstances, and that which is the greatest of calamities leads by little and little to a government.

“I do not express these ideas on the effects of the interposition of a foreign war in a revolution, for the first time to-day. I had warned the royalists of them in 1791.

“At this moment things have reached such a point, that the continuation of the war is absolutely unavoidable: the foreign powers and the French Revolution having once joined in battle, it is a death-struggle. One of the two must perish; the name of peace can be pronounced only on the ruins of one or the other.”

This terrible assertion was a capital point to enlarge upon. It was necessary to demonstrate its importance, to prove by anticipation that any general or partial peace would be a delusion.

“Let there be no mistake in the matter. Such a peace, like any peace in general, could never, whatever might be its articles, be more than a suspension of arms—a truce of some months’ duration. France, freed from the influence of the germs of dissension which devour her, would very soon be delivered from that dangerous position by the factious men who rule her. ‘The tyrants are vanquished,’ they would say: but they are not sub-

jugated.' Here these men are, and all the extraordinary forces of the war would remain with them unimpaired. They would demean themselves towards the sovereigns of Europe as they demeaned themselves towards their own, after having got him to disband his troops. The slightest movements of the powers would have their commentary in the Place de Grève, and be judged by fraternal societies. They would see conspiracies in all quarters, as they saw them in France: the insolence of their ambassadors and emissaries would carry the tricolour and disorder everywhere: they would take up their abode at the courts of the sovereigns in the name of the French Republic, to keep watch on them even in their own homes, and become familiar with the slightest details of their private life. They would interfere in all political differences of nations, and above all, in their internal jars: they would declare themselves, like the Romans, universal pacificators and arbitrators; they would make allies of all their enemies' enemies, in order to destroy one by the other. All the factious, all the rebels, all the malcontents of all countries, would find a staunch supporter in the French Government. They would be Protestant at Rome and in Spain, Catholic in Ireland, Presbyterian in London. Here, they would declare, there, foment war: everywhere they would use the elements of revolution round about them to extend and generalize it; and all, without wishing or knowing it to be so, would concur in hastening the consummation. An universal blindness would enlist in the service of the revolution all rancours, all ambitions, and all parties. There are those who reject it to-day on conviction, who would soon em-

brace it as an instrument of their hatred or their projects. At London, for instance, I am willing to believe that Mr. Fox does not favour the French Revolution, any more than Mirabeau and the Constitutionals at Paris favoured the Republic; than the insurgents of Brabant favoured the destruction of their religion and their states; than the bankers, traders, and artists of France favoured the loss of their property. It is thus that a revolution is founded upon the follies and passions of men; thus it has taken root in France. In the same manner it would, step by step, gain ground in other countries, even those which, defended by their seas or rigorous climates, believe themselves to-day in a sort of roadstead out of the reach of these hurricanes. Such would be the effect of every sort of peace or of agreement made to-day with France which allowed its revolution to be in force."

Arriving at length to the means of making an effective war upon the revolution, Mallet insists at first upon the true principles of conduct applicable to the circumstances, a species of direction the importance of which has been too much misunderstood. At first, and before all, the French people must be undeceived respecting the conviction under which they labour, that it is a war of liberty against tyranny, of the rights of men against the aristocracy: the cause of the sovereigns must at no price be allowed to be separated from that of the people: that he had already recommended at Frankfort.

2nd. The allied powers must surround themselves with men accustomed to revolutionary movements, the unusual operations of a revolution, such as was seen in

France, being to politics what elephants and gunpowder have been to armies, which defeat the experience of the wise. "In ordinary times," Mallet says, "the most intelligent men are the most moderate; in times of crisis the most ardent men are the wisest."

3rd. A counter-revolution being nothing else but a revolution against a revolution, the means of the counter-revolution are essentially those of the revolution itself: it is only by managing the elements of the anarchy and of the Republic to be dealt with, that it is possible to attain the desired object.

4th. It is very important to the allied powers to excite interior movements, but on the condition of profiting by them, not of seizing upon them, which would immediately annihilate their effect. This essential point is treated with force.

Following up these principles, Mallet proposes to lead the nations themselves to a voluntary alliance against the revolution, which must at the same time fill them with indignation and fear. This act of fraternity and of mutual protection was to commence in Brabant, to extend gradually, and to be the occasion of the formation of an immense army of national defence, designed principally for the protection of the frontiers; this treaty was to be signed at solemn festivals, suited to move the imagination; the sovereigns were to appear there personally. According as the armies advanced into the French territory, they were to organize there on the same plan, armies of defence, in such a manner that they might be formidably supported in their rear, and thus be able to adopt the rapid movements which the circumstances of the war might demand.

Such are the chief measures recommended by the author of the pamphlet :

“With the whole of these measures,” says he, in conclusion, “the author of this pamphlet dares to assert, that the war will change its aspect before six months ; that an immense treasury of resources in public opinion, in enthusiasm, in money, in men, in contributions of every kind, in success of every species, will result from it, and that the war will be, by these means, undoubtedly terminated in the next campaign.”

However, it was not a treatise on strategy which the writer intended to compose in this pamphlet. He does not make plans of a campaign like the Abbé de Pradt, he knows only where precious weapons are to be found which are not employed, and he discovers and recommends the use of them. The value of his counsel cannot be judged of, because the execution of them was then scarcely sketched. Only it may be remarked, that in their principle they have a manifest analogy with the plans of national defence which were adopted in 1813, by Prussia, under the influence of Stein ; they also call to mind the corps of volunteers, which were armed by England, when Bonaparte at Boulogne threatened Great Britain with an invasion ; but the moment had perhaps not yet come, when nations would voluntarily lend themselves to this great movement. Be it as it may, this idea with which Mallet had occupied himself for a long time, shared with so many of his ideas the fate of prematurity. At any rate, the arguments and the facts by which Mallet attacked every idea of peace with the Convention, and showed the neces-

sity of a common defence against the systematic encroachments of the French Revolution, made a due impression on Mr. Pitt, and on the Count Mercy-Argenteau, who was much consulted by the Emperor. Without exaggerating the importance of the advice of a simple literary man, it must be permitted us to compare the vigorous truth exhibited in this pamphlet, as in the preceding ones addressed to the Ministers of Great Britain and of Austria, with the better understanding entered into at the commencement of 1794, between these two great states, with the resolution then adopted by the Emperor, to open a new campaign with more energy; finally, with those remarkable sittings of the English Parliament,* where Pitt justified the war party against the eloquence of Sheridan, of Fox, and of the Marquis of Lansdowne, who censured with acrimony the conduct of the cabinet, and demanded peace with France. In his speeches in both houses, Pitt more than once made use of the arguments and reflections, and even of the turn of ideas which recel to mind the pamphlet of Mallet du Pan. In these long debates, in which the cause of the revolution was discussed, attacked or defended with the most fierce vehemence, the speakers continually supported themselves with quotations and authorities borrowed from French politicians. If Brissot was the oracle whom the opposition continually invoked with astonishing simplicity, in order to justify its sympathetic illusions in favour of the

* This pamphlet of Mallet du Pan was delivered to Lord Elgin on the 20th of November, 1793, and followed by a second one the 1st of February, 1794. The session of the English Parliament was opened the 21st of January, 1794.

French Republic, it was very natural that Mr. Pitt, on his part, should have drawn safe weapons from documents,* where an honest man, an observer gifted with sagacity, showed the true state, not the romance of revolutionary France.

* Be it as it may, the minister coincides with the author of the pamphlet, in opposing to the party of peace the following consideration: "If even," said he, in concluding a remarkable speech, "if even you should hurry to send an ambassador to treat with the Convention, you would be obliged not only to recognize the unity and indivisibility of the French Republic, but moreover to recognize it in the sense of your enemies, namely, as being founded upon liberty and equality: you would be obliged to subscribe to their whole code, and by this act sanction the deposition of your sovereign, and the annihilation of your legislature. It would be of no use to say that they would not insist on an avowal of that extent; whatever may have been the extravagance of their speeches, they have always surpassed it by their actions. We have no hope of moderation; whatever may be the dominant party, the more violent men have always had the advantage. The distinctive mark of their character is a spirit of military enterprise, not in order to satisfy their ambition, but to spread everywhere desolation and terror. . . . In this state of things what have we better to do than to resist them till the time when Providence, blessing our efforts, will have assured to us the independence of our country, with which the general interest of Europe is bound up."

CONFIRMATORY DOCUMENTS

AND

APPENDIX.

I.

PAGE 269.

“ A Paris, le haut, du pavé restait toujours aux agitateurs ; partout, dans les cafés, dans les théâtres, les Jacobins faisaient tomber leurs adversaires devant le drapeau trocolore.”

TOWARDS the termination of his editorship of the “*Mer-cure*,” in the beginning of February, 1792, Mallet du Pan depicted the political features of the amusements of Paris, in an interesting article which the course of our narrative obliged us to defer to this appendix.

“ During the last week, from February 15th to 29th, the theatres have become the arena of party demonstrations : this inconsiderate contest has placed theatres, actors, and spectators under the rod of the Jacobins. The Queen, imprudently advised, was recently present at the *Comédie Italienne* ; a couplet was seized on as an allusion—some common-place ; the people were excited ; shouts of ‘ *Vive la Reine* ’ filled the house. Some Jacobins present were offended at this : a disorder commenced, but was repressed

in time. Since that day, every theatre has become a scene of vociferation, and conflicts afterwards. Certainly, nothing is more estimable than the sentiments manifested towards the King and his august family : the situation of this monarch, embittered by trouble, could not inspire too ardent wishes for his safety and happiness ; but when these effusions of feeling are given way to in public, people should be certain of the power to defend the liberty of doing so, which would otherwise be compromised, an occasion being offered for disturbances, and pretexts furnished to their adversaries to exercise violence and openly insult the objects of respect of all good citizens.

“ It is no longer allowable to cry ‘ Vive le Roi ! ’ still less to laugh at a Jacobin poet. On Saturday, an opera called ‘ L’Auteur d’un Moment ’ was played at the Vaudeville Theatre, in which the author ridiculed MM. Chénier and Palissot, but without going beyond the limits of allowable satire, and certainly, without equalling the licence of the two writers against whom the piece was directed. All Paris remembers that M. Palissot, enriched by patrons and pensions, formerly brought J. J. Rousseau upon the scene crawling on all fours and eating lettuces ; the auxiliary of the government, of the parliament, of the clergy, he did not scruple to sacrifice to public derision, to denounce to the vengeance of the laws, the encyclopedists, when they were in danger. That which most powerfully excited the fancy of M. Palissot, was the spirit of independence of the philosophers, their protests against tyranny, their manner of governing kings ; in each of his forgotten pieces he resumes his bloody whip, and consoles himself with the hatred of his colleagues by reading over the warrants for his

pensions. Well, after sixty years M. Palissot has opened his eyes—the worshipper of kings has broken his idol.

“M. Chénier, his disciple, had given proofs of his patriotism in ‘Charles IX:’ he has supported them in a declamation, in three acts, which he calls ‘Caius Gracchus,’ a tragedy, which is nothing more than a book of Vertot badly read, badly commented, and tediously dialogued: it may well be imagined that all the wordy common-places against the aristocracy, the tirades upon the people, the invectives against the senate, and all the farrago of a college republican are included in this piece.

“These two writers, *genus irritabile vatum*, have not been able to stomach ‘l’Auteur d’un Moment,’ which was received and applauded with transport, commanding crowded audiences made up of the detractors of the rulers of our kings. The royalists abuse their advantage by repeating the smartest passages. Finally, on Saturday, hisses, which had been manifested during the previous representations, were mixed with the applause without succeeding in abating it. The Jacobins had recourse to other means. One of them got up, and, mounting a seat, addressed his adversaries and the actors, and wounded a national guard who attempted to stop him: for a moment he bewildered every one around him by his audacity, but was soon attacked and knocked down. Blows fell right and left; the Jacobins were turned out, and two of the rioters, it is said, were taken into custody by the police. The piece was concluded, but, before the theatre was closed, the Jacobins assembled their party in the street. The entrances to the theatre were closed, and the National Guard prevented this furious mob from entering. When

the audience came out, they found themselves in the midst of a crowd of citizens who had employed their time in collecting together into heaps the mud and snow, and who compelled every one to cry, 'Vive la nation !' One worthy man, an old gendarme, replied with spirit, 'I will not cry "Vive la nation," because it is immortal; but I will cry "Vive le Roi," because we have need to protect him: if any one dares to touch me, he will have to fight.' He was not molested. The most elegant women were obliged to wade through the heaps of mud to reach their carriages: one of the King's pages, English by birth and of the Catholic family of Swinburne, was thrown down, dragged through the mud, and dangerously wounded in the head. The King's uniform probably excited the rage of the perpetrators of this act. Thus concluded the evening's amusement.

"When it is remembered that similar scenes go on at thirty places of amusement in Paris, a strange idea will be formed of our civilization.

"The next day the Jacobins returned in greater numbers to the same theatre, to consummate their triumph; and, in spite of the remonstrances of the *commissaire* of the section in favour of law and liberty, they compelled the actors to burn, in their presence, the play withdrawn the previous evening. They have resumed the same ascendancy at all the theatres; constituting themselves despotic arbitrators of thought, expressions, and allusions—it is no longer allowable to manifest an opinion contrary to theirs.

"To crown this noble achievement of proscribing a play, contrary to the rights of the author, of liberty, of the public, although it did not offend the laws, morals, or public authorities, the Minister of the Interior has interfered in the

quarrel. He has written a fine letter to the department, in which he places the cry of ‘Vive le Roi’ among the number of treasonable crimes against the nation. ‘They are conspirators,’ says he, ‘who presume to express impious desires by wishing a happiness to the King, independent of the nation.’

“Thus, having destroyed, as an invention of despotism, the police of the theatres, after having freed the theatre of all restraint, in conformity with the rights of man, and those of the revolution, it is to be put in fetters. The new *régime* is, in its turn, about to proscribe every half line which savours of political heresy, and differs from the maxims of M. Chénier. Now they talk of the danger of opinion, and we have to go over the same ground again.

II.

PAGE 290.

Au sujet de la mission politique de Mallet du Pan auprès de l'empereur et du roi de Prusse :

“Le mémoire, rédigé par Mallet, et corrigé par le roi, est plus explicite.”

THE expression is not sufficiently exact. The memorial which Mallet du Pan presented at Frankfort to the Emperor and the King of Prussia on the part of Louis XVI. was drawn up from the groundwork decided upon by the King, afterwards put into form by Mallet, and then enlarged with notes by the King's own hand, so that, in the absence of that copy which was placed in the

Augustin, in the library of the Minister, the memorial is the most authentic expression of the royal intentions. In our account of the mission of Mallet to Frankfort, we only gave an extract from this document : we here reproduce it entire :

MEMORIAL PRESENTED BY MALLET DU PAN TO THE ALLIED
SOVEREIGNS ON THE PART OF LOUIS XVI.

“ July, 1792.

“Two inseparable objects present themselves in the conduct and aim of the impending counter-revolution : first, the means of effecting it ; afterwards, those of maintaining it. Without their mutual connexion, the means of success may counteract its stability, and the victories gained would only pave the way for fresh dangers, and fresh disturbances.

“The means of success lie in combination and in foreign forces ; but the present consideration of the matter must not be limited, solely, to the first resistance which would be offered by the armies of the revolution.

“We must guard against the consequences of their defeat, of their dispersion at the moment when they fall back into the interior ; the support which these undisciplined masses promise to afford to the leaders of the factious, who will endeavour to reunite them in the southern provinces ; the transition from presumption to ferocity, the habits of sudden violence which the people have been led to contract in each moment of crisis ; the grief which one day of frenzy or of the rule of the demagogues might spread over the royal family, and over all

those whose sentiments are known to be aristocratic, or are only suspected to be so. It is, moreover, necessary to prevent a reunion of the divided revolutionists, without destroying the motives of rallying, and to reduce the resistance to the least possible time. The attempt should even be made to render those revolutionists their adversaries, who have been roused by the anarchy, by reflection, personal disappointments, and the tyranny of the Jacobins; and to conciliate them as auxiliaries for internal security.

“In order to effect this, it appears necessary to employ measures calculated at once to inspire terror and confidence, or, in other words, to take away from some the hope of avoiding the consequences of the war which they have provoked; to preserve to others the trust that their consequences will be less fatal to them, than the oppression under which they groan, or than a constitution which cannot even protect them against the power of the clubs.

I.

“The importance of this separation of interests, upon which now depends the safeguard of the interior, and upon which will depend the facility of restoring the whole kingdom to obedience, will be but imperfectly comprehended if a just idea is not formed of the different parties who agitate the capital and dispute authority there.

“It is at this moment almost entirely under the hands of the Jacobins, who form a majority in the National Assembly, occupy important places, and possess the municipality. The ministry has only just escaped them. At once they have armed the mob against the King: it is

morally impossible that the present council of His Majesty could support itself for a month.

“The Jacobins are divided into two sections which tend to obtain nearly the same end by different means, and which, frequently embroiled by personal dissensions of ambition or distrust, are always ready to combine, whenever it is required, to strike a fresh blow at the royal prerogative, or to execute outrages against the superior classes.

“The section actually predominating is presided over by the Abbé Sicys, who, together with Brissot, Condorcet, Pétion, Gensonné, Vergniaud, Guadet and Manuel governs it. This cabal formed the last ministry. Besides its own adherents, its decisions are very frequently supported by the majority of the two hundred and fifty imposters, intriguers, or cowards who are classed in the National Assembly under the nickname of *Independents*.

“The project of this cabal is not the nominal republic, but the republic in fact, by the reduction of the civil list by five millions, by the retrenchment of the greater part of the King’s power, by an alteration of the dynasty, of which the new chief should be a kind of honorary President of the Republic, to whom they would give an executive council nominated by the Assembly, that is to say, by their committee.

“The second league which separates the Jacobins is composed of the more coarse agitators, the restless republicans, those wretches who, unable to support any government, desire an eternity of anarchy. No other principles can be found among them than a vigorous application of the rights of man. By the aid of this charter, they aspire to change laws and public officers every half year, to spread

levelling principles over all regular authority, legal pre-eminence, and property. They will have no King; the only *régime* which they are ambitious of, is a democracy of the debating mob.

“Robespierre, Danton, Chabot, Merlin, Bazire, Thuriot, and a hundred others of this stamp, supported by the club of the Cordeliers and the fraternal societies, conduct this disorderly faction, which maintains a very numerous party in the club of the Jacobins, disposes of the greater part of the popular libellers, the men of pikes, and the scum of the capital.

“Jealousy and a difference of opinion on the subject of the war, wrought discord between these two cabals: it might easily be seen that they were about to separate. A hatred of monarchical government, and the necessity of keeping ahead of the Feuillants, did not hinder their tendency to combine.

“Both make use of the same means—with this difference, that the former proceed less openly, observe some decency, and conduct their crimes with less impetuosity. They have the advantage over the others of refinement, talent, and a plan, the principal lines of which were drawn by the Abbé Sieyès. The vilest agents, professional agitators, brigands, fanatics, and scoundrels of all kinds—such are their common instruments; they do not leave them inactive for a day.

“The Duke of Orleans is connected with the latter of these two confederacies, the only one from whose complete overthrow he has anything to hope.

“It is less easy to classify the constitutionalists, or Feuillants. They form a heterogeneous complication of opposite views—various inconsistencies, dislikes without

analogy, contradictory plans or metaphysical enthusiasm and disappointed ambition, which they endeavour to satisfy.

“In the absence of power and real force, the most prominent of these parties have had recourse to intrigue. They have manœuvred at the Tuileries, in the Assembly, in the departments, and sought to seize upon the government and the legislative body by means of the King’s money. Their principal object was to crush the Jacobins, to drive out by the departments and by the people, the actual members of the Assembly, and to substitute in their stead a new Assembly, in which the King was to summon a party of the constitutionalists, and then to modify the constitution by enforcing the royal prerogative, and by instituting a second chamber, whose members were to be elected by the people, under certain conditions.

“This enterprise, which several persons, intimate with their Majesties, have believed easy of execution, by looking upon it as a roadstead of momentary safety, has soon become known and defeated.

“The sole effect of these intrigues has been to injure M. de Lessart at Orleans, to create new danger for the King, to furnish the Jacobins with means of attack, and to kindle an implacable hatred between them and the Feuillants.

“The two Lameths, Beaumetz, Barnave, Duport, d’André, directed this project. They endeavoured to draw to the Feuillants all those who wished for the constitution without a King, or rather, all those who wished for a constitution without becoming Jacobins.

“M.M. de La Fayette, de Narbonne, and another set of contrivers followed similar views, but by means principally drawn from the army. Consequently, M. de

Narbonne supports the war in the council. These measures, quite in the spirit of the genius of their authors, and conducted with extreme rashness, have not had more success than the former ones.

“ Under these two orders of leaders, the whole body of the Feuillants range themselves in the Assembly, in the capital, and the provinces, but without founding a real party ; for they are not distinguished by doctrines, a plan in common, a system of means, or calculated resources. The inclination which has always led a party of these Constitutionals to adopt the least perilous measures, has prescribed to them an offensive, but impotent war against the aristocrats, and a defensive war against the powerful Jacobins.

“ A considerable number has hoisted this standard from policy, in order to escape from the fury which pursues those who disapprove too openly of the constitution. Many government officers, new judges, *bourgeois* proprietors in town and country, and about a hundred members of the Legislative Assembly, are included in the first category, which contains, in general, the honest people of the party ; and those in point of fact are conscious of the impossibility of supporting the new *régime*.

“ After them came the idolators of the constitution ; a set of maniacs, whom a factitious enthusiasm of political dilettantism attaches to this superstition. They have persuaded themselves that without the Jacobins the constitution would work, and it has not yet been practicable to make them perceive that the constitution alone bred and brought up the Jacobins, and that, were those of the Rue Saint-Honoré destroyed, it would send forth relays within six months.

“A third class of Constitutionalists are swayed by interest and vanity; those for whom the existing government has procured posts or other advantages, by interest; those on whom it has conferred distinction, by vanity. A considerable portion of the unsalaried National Guard are influenced by one or other of these two motives.

“For the most part, a spirit of discontent is discernible in these three divisions; a complete uncertainty as to the duration of the constitution, a bias at once instinctive and rational in favour of monarchs, and even a greater hatred against the Jacobins than against the aristocrats.

“Heading these, as we have before said, are the more lawless spirits, who with an ambition to become chiefs, have never been able to attain distinction from the moment they abandoned those unworthy means by which they aided in effecting and maintaining the Revolution.

“It is questionable whether ten of these dethroned demagogues could be found of identical views and motives.

“Some have a horror of crime, and sincerely desire to save the King and the monarchy.

“Others only aspire to rule, to exalt their faction above that of the Jacobins, and to possess themselves of the chief authority.

“A third would acquiesce in a counter-revolution which left them considerable influence, or would at any rate forbear re-consigning them to abasement and obscurity.

“Besides these, there exist men in whom a detestable conduct during two years and a half, now inspires—if not remorse, at least fear; who, without justifying their own crimes, dread their chastisement; who are exasperated at

the triumph of those classes towards whom they exercised no consideration, and whose every passion would be mortified by a counter-revolution, though their positive opinions might not perhaps be much jarred.

“These Constitutionalists, whether honest or otherwise, comprise a great majority in every order of those citizens, who chose and adopted the Revolution, but who were infected with unsettled opinions, incompatible ideas, the folly of lamenting effects, while swearing to maintain their cause, and an utter want of character, union, or boldness. And thus, made up of political romancers, theoretic writers, speechifiers, intriguers, Machiavellian spirits, without views and without nerve, this constitutional party has never possessed more than an artificial and evanescent existence.

“We shall not here dilate on that particular section, which, before the Versailles outrage interposed between the first two orders, and the framers of the existing constitution—that is to say, on the partisans of a legislative body in two divisions, of which one was to be a chamber of peers, on the formation of which, the followers of this representative system never expressed any definite idea. Although steadfast in their opinions, usually equally ill-understood, and ill-judged, but now modified by the sad experience in which they were deficient; they agree as to the necessity of re-establishing the royal authority in such strength and dignity as are compatible with such a degree of public liberty as the government of a great empire can sustain. They are unanimous in demanding the restoration of the clergy, the national religion, the nobility, and the higher courts. No sort of opposition is to be feared from them; for there is not a

man among them who would not prefer even an absolute monarchy to the present monstrous laws, and to the rule of those who have instituted them.

II.

“The political map just sketched must help to indicate beforehand the different effects which will be produced on men’s minds by the approach, growth, and existence of the counter-revolution, according to the forms and means by which it will be brought about.

“Evidently it must affect, in different ways, these dis-united sections, whose passions, principles, and interests, consonant on certain points, are discordant on all the rest.

“Sound policy, therefore, dictates that those interests which tally with the fundamental object of the counter-revolution be conciliated; an opposite course would unite the entire mass of revolutionists in the wish for and plan of a prolonged opposition.

“Every course which tends to disarm resistance and facilitate submission, must be adopted: now, the true means of generalizing the former and retarding the latter, would be to furnish all parties alike with equal motives for persevering in rebellion.

“These considerations cannot apply to the head or to one portion of the Jacobins. They can be subjugated by terror only: their maxims, their plans, their examples, preclude the possibility of trusting them. Their interest is vested in crime—their sole resource is crime. Forbearance would seem to them a symptom of timidity, and make

them the bolder. Force must, therefore, assume towards them its most menacing aspect. The manifesto will regard these corporations, which excite horror and scandal in three quarters of the nation, as excommunicated societies to whom no hope of escape for themselves, or toleration of their doctrines, must be allowed. Life is all that can be held out to those among them whom fanaticism or error have not incited to crime, and who are willing to abandon the colours of their unworthy chiefs.

“ They alone provoked the war—they must bear its punishment.

“ But this great truth, which cannot be announced in too denunciatory a form, must leave an opening for the far more numerous residue of comparatively moderate revolutionists. It would be unjust and dangerous to confound them with the frantic men of faction who sway the realm; for, in that case, through necessity or weakness, they would throw themselves into the party of the latter, and would probably render themselves, were it only through inertia, the accomplices of their opposition and of their ulterior enterprises.

“ Towards this majority, prudence counsels the simultaneous employment of terror and of confidence.

“ Of terror: for this alone can destroy the illusions with which many of them persist in blinding themselves. Inspire some courage into the weak souls whom fear of the Jacobins or mere habit would restore to the dominant faction, if they did not see it on the eve of overthrow; make a deep impression on minds undecided or seduced by error, by showing them that the last day of delusions is come; counterbalance in others the false point of honour which still

urges them to the defence of the constitution ; and, above all, take from the chiefs of the Feuillants the hope on which they have founded all their views these six months—that of qualifying themselves to make terms with arms in their hands, and to conclude by a capitulation.

“ Confidence will sustain the effect of terror ; it will lead it to the desired result of reducing resistance to that of the Jacobins alone, and of counterbalancing, during the final crisis, their influence in the interior, which might otherwise bring forth new catastrophes.

“ This confidence is nothing more than security for the future. It will spring from the assurance that there is no desire to confound deluded men with the factious, to whom nothing is sacred ; aberrations of mind with perversity ; erroneous opinions with a system of crimes, immorality and anarchy.

“ Not only will the making of this distinction flatter the self-esteem of the constitutionalists : it will appear to them, in addition, a proof of equity : it will show them their security ; and they cannot be supposed so mad as to share the resistance of the Jacobins, when they have not the same dangers to dread.

“ It will spring from the care taken to destroy the apprehensions spread abroad of meditated vengeance, implacable resentment, oppression that will include errors equally with crimes.

“ It will spring, in conclusion and especially, from the opinion that the King alone will be the arbiter of the fate of the different parties, and the pacificator of the kingdom ; that to him alone is reserved the fate of the laws, as well as of persons ; in a word, that neither will be delivered

over to the good pleasure of the emigrants and to them exclusively, nor to the foreign powers. The tyranny of the Jacobins has forced the Feuillants and the greater part of the ashamed or half-converted revolutionists, at length to consider the royal authority as their ark of refuge. If they were to triumph over their adversaries to-morrow, beyond doubt they would immediately strengthen the power of the King. The majority would have rallied round his Majesty these three months, had their courage equalled their good will, and had not the Jacobins, with their indefatigable activity, held the daggers of their bravos and the torches of their incendiaries over any or every one who dared avow his attachment to the monarch."

III.

"The preceding terms depend on the belligerent parties and on the French Princes and emigrants. They are the desire of the King, the counsel dictated to him by positive information and the interest of all. His Majesty attaches the highest importance to ensuring the mature consideration of his statements. He goes so far as to join prayers to entreaties, to obtain for them the grave attention he solicits.

"He solicits that attention in the full independence of his reflection and his will. No foreign impulse has either prepared or produced his recommendations in this respect; they result from the accurate knowledge his Majesty possesses of the public feeling, through the daily accounts faithfully given to him of the capital and the departments:

so that no one in the kingdom, or out of it, commands so much certain information to establish what it is to be feared or hoped from the interior, according to the nature of the forms or measures by which the external force will be developed. All will become easy in the present and the future if the views of the King are acted upon ; all will be complicated—perhaps with dangers, uncertainty and difficulties—if they are departed from.

“ Force must re-establish the monarchy ; but it is for opinion to consolidate it. The roots of stability must be planted in men’s hearts ; the means of compulsory submission, and the efforts of all who would prevent fresh convulsions, must aim at implanting moral submission.

“ In this paper I shall only consider the motives of persuasion which concern the expatriated royalists. His Majesty counts on their acquiescence in his enlightened intentions, from the attachment and disinterestedness of the princes of his blood, as well as from the feelings of the brave nobility, who has sacrificed all to the desire of saving the monarchy, and of the citizens of all ranks who have shared its sufferings and its exile.

“ The King desires that their participation in the present war may not, by too offensive and prominent a concurrence on their part, deprive it of the character of a foreign war, between hostile powers.

“ His Majesty, however, has never questioned that an unanimous resolution prevails, of confiding to him the care of the interests concerned, nor does he imagine that the Princes would consider themselves aggrieved in a dispute, the arbitration of which will be exercised by his Majesty,

when the fate of war shall have restored the requisite liberty to the exercise of the royal power.

“Doubtless, the Princes and the nobility would have but too good grounds for avenging three years of insult and oppression, and for themselves attacking usurpers so criminal. Doubtless, there was a moment when civil war would have been, on the part of the oppressed, only an exercise of the right of repelling force by force. Public and private calamities would, perhaps, have lasted less long without being sharper.

“But the foreign war which Providence inspired the factious to declare, is destined now to effect with fewer perils, uncertainties and anxieties, what might have been hoped from civil war.

“Let us avert from France the accumulation of both these plagues. They would extend, in the most dreadful manner, over three hundred thousand families, dispersed amid a frantic people ; would endanger the life of the King, of the Queen, and the Royal Family ; would lead to the overthrow of the throne, the giving up of property to pillage, the murder of the royalists, and of the priests who remain in the kingdom and are already menaced ; would ally to the Jacobins the less outrageous revolutionists : would reanimate an excitement which tends to die out, and exasperate a resistance which will quail before the first decisive successes, when mediators shall be seen between the armed emigrants and that part of the nation which is to be reduced.

“The human heart does not alter. All is to be feared from those who have been poignantly offended ; no pardon

is hoped from those towards whom no pity has been shown. The people is incapable of rising to a generosity of which it does not itself possess the feeling.

“The different factions which have convulsed the kingdom dread, consequently, to find in the Princes and the emigrants, enemies from whom they can expect no forbearance. They picture them as environed by chains, executioners, punishments, instruments of oppression.

“This execrable prejudice has been unceasingly fomented by the revolutionary libellers, by the speechmakers in the tribune, by the efforts of the two assemblies and of the clubs: and, to say the truth, the inconsiderate expressions of some young and hot-headed persons, the imprudent and ever-threatening virulence of some royalist writers who talk of nothing but gibbets, and the long-suffering silence which the Princes thought due to their dignity, amid the ever-renewed imputations and the proscriptions of the Assembly, have envenomed and imparted a deep root to this apprehension.

“It is easy to foresee its consequences, in case the emigrants, in bands, should act effectively and separately from the foreign armies, or direct offensive operations against the frontiers of the realm.

“The rage, the resistance, the thirst of blood of their antagonists would be levelled at them. Other points would be left unprotected; France would be abandoned to the foreigners, in order to close it against the emigrants. Prisoners, if not butchered, would become the victims of all sorts of violence. The equanimity of the brave soldiers who will march under the banners of the Princes, would be utterly vain against men who respect neither the laws of

war nor those of honour. Let not the fear of reprisals be urged. Did that prevent the murder of the Tyrolese? Has popular ferocity or that of a licentious soldiery, despising all restraint, ever been subordinated to the calculation of foresight?

“The first intelligence of an action between the royalists exclusively and that of the troops of the National Assembly, would be the pretext for new crimes and the signal for a butchery in all the places where the clubs sway the administrative authorities.

“By bringing the foreign armies on the kingdom, the Jacobins have weakened the opinion that the invasion resulted from the efforts of the emigrants. Contrary to their intention, that extravagant step has secured a degree of safety to the royalists of the interior. The inhabitants of the departments no longer threaten with massacre and death the adherents of those whom their party went to attack on the frontier. The premature approach of the royalists from without, and their independent junction to open for themselves, unassisted by the foreign troops, a passage into the kingdom, would revive this popular inclination in full force.

“We must not exaggerate the effects of fear. Undoubtedly, if the people are alarmed, they are less likely to resort to outrage; but it is neither so expeditious nor so easy as is imagined, to inspire a salutary dread in chiefs whose ignorance and presumption are attested by every thing they do; who are themselves dupes of the illusions they have created; who, numbering up their citizens, believe themselves invincible, and who calculate the chances of war, as they did those of legislation, by the multiplication

table. Unquestionably, reflection and reason would undeceive them; but were they rational and reflective, would their conduct during these six months have displayed one continuous series of furious excesses?

“It will be equally difficult to impress the people with an efficacious fear. Generally speaking, the multitude are insensible of all dangers, except those of whose existence they have palpable evidence. The Parisians, in particular, are of this character: their ignorance and inconceivable credulity place them at the mercy of the grossest deceptions: they are beset daily by writings, fables, public speakers, presidents of cliques, pot-house and work-shop readers, all in league to impress upon them their victories, their conquests, the distress of their enemies, the immensity of their power, the talent of their chiefs, the enthusiasm which French liberty excites in all nations and all armies. Only those who have witnessed these rendezvous of instruction, which serve to irritate popular prejudices—only those who have examined the various ranks, beginning at what are called the respectable citizens of Paris and ending at the mob, can fully appreciate the success of the demagogues in this undertaking, as in every other.

“These reflections, founded on continuous observation, will perhaps induce his Majesty’s august brothers, their council and the royalists, to subordinate their impatient courage to prudence, and, once armed, to act with the precautions at the time, and on the system which may obviate the misfortunes inseparable from any other course.

“The same reasons make it evident that, if the Princes publish a declaration before proceeding to action, this

manifesto should tally with that of the powers, and should not extend beyond general assurances, avoiding all that might give scope for unfair construction from the factious : it should display the Princes as liberators of the people as much as of the King ; it should promise peace, security, legitimate liberty ;—all should be excluded from it which would show a bias in favour of this or that form of government ; it should only declare that the King's restoration to freedom, and the re-establishment of that limited monarchy which his Majesty contemplated, are aimed at.

“ His most Christian Majesty, full of confidence in the generous sentiments and wisdom of the Courts of Vienna and Berlin, is happy to anticipate that they will take into equal consideration his own situation, that of the French monarchy, and the means which may terminate the present war, without exposing the interior of the kingdom to fresh disasters.

“ He desires—he begs—that the preparatory manifesto be drawn up on grounds analogous to those whose importance has just been demonstrated, and that its publication be hastened to avert impending calamities.

“ He is convinced that the good effects which may be expected from such fears as are to be excited, will arise from the factious acquiring a certainty that in declaring war against his Apostolic Majesty, they virtually declare it against all Europe, and that the manifesto of the Courts of Vienna and Berlin express sentiments and intentions common to the several powers who have formed the alliance. The people invariably calculate their dangers by the number of their enemies : the chiefs will lose the re-

source of deceiving them, as has been the case hitherto, by an assurance that neither the Germanic body, nor the northern potentates, nor those of the south will take part in the pending quarrel: so threatening an union will dispel the mist of delusions, and prove only the more efficacious because neither the Assembly nor the people are prepared for it.

“With the same object, it appears imperative that the manifesto leave no hopes of the laying down of arms, until the King be set free, and his legitimate authority re-established. All that could indicate any possibility of escaping the chances of war by means of dilatory negotiations, or imperfect accommodations, would but retard submission and expose the King to fresh dangers, for renewed acts of violence, to which he would probably be compelled to submit, would be employed to compel him to restrain the activity of the belligerent powers.

“Another—and indeed the principal—means of striking terror, is an energetic protest addressed to the National Assembly, the capital, the administrative bodies, the municipalities, and all individuals, to the effect that they individually will be held responsible in person and property for the smallest hurt done to the persons of their Majesties, their families, or any citizen whatsoever. This declaration must be more particularly directed against the city of Paris.

“Terror will be rendered effectual by confidence in the assurance that war is declared against the factious, not against the King and the nation; that it is declared in defence of legitimate government and of the whole people

themselves against a ferocious anarchy which menaces the peace of all Europe, prepares the most horrible calamities, and destroys the social bond.

“Thus, factions will be deprived of an argument from which they have drawn, and will still seek to draw, the utmost advantage; namely, that this is a war of *kings against nations*.

“The confidence, thus founded on disunion between the factious, now masters of the kingdom, and the remainder of the nation, would be increased by care not to propose or prescribe any form of government, and by declaring that arms are resorted to for the re-establishment of the monarchy, the liberty of the monarch, and the restoration of peace.

“This measure will reassure the greater portion of those disappointed or vacillating republicans, who, though dissatisfied with the existing constitution, dread the renewal of great abuses, vengeance and oppression, and who know that his most Christian Majesty will be their best guardian from these dangers, and from whom submission may be expected, when a way is offered them without ignominy, a monarchy without tyranny, and laws that will protect both persons and property.

“The wisdom of their imperial and royal Majesties will doubtless have forestalled these remarks: the destiny of the King, the Queen, the Royal Family, the throne, all the proprietors, and the entire kingdom, may hang upon them.

“But the prompt appearance of the manifesto occupies at this moment the first place in his most Christian

Majesty's mind. He invokes it with redoubled urgency : all who surround him, all who judge rationally of the movements in Paris, unite in this prayer.

“At this moment, war is forgotten in Paris and in the provinces ; it is no more thought of or feared than the English war in Hindostan. Vainly do the newspapers announce the march of foreign troops : a hundred popular libels daily reassure the Parisians. The absolute silence of the powers, ever since the hostile declaration of the Assembly, the defensive war of Brabant, unimportant reverses, unfelt affronts, the necessarily slow formation of armies, the ruin, the distress, the state of dispersion in which the French emigrants remain—all have concurred to increase the hallucination. The apprehensions of the most timid do not go beyond the notion that, before daring to engage in war, their adversaries will propose terms which they would laugh at, as they do at the danger their frontiers seem exposed to.

“To these various causes of security, are due the progress of the authority of the Jacobins, their last enterprises, and the horrible outrage of the 20th of June. They have been allowed time to mature the concoction of new catastrophes : the slightest delay will give them time to execute them.

“We must not deceive ourselves. If that dreadful day of the 20th of June—that scene unprecedented even among the crimes of the revolution, where their Majesties were given over to outrage, exposed to dangers which make the imagination shudder—if that day of sorrow and shame did not close with a double regicide, this is due to but a single circumstance. Their Majesties were saved

solely by one of those popular impressions which the precautions of demagogues cannot obviate. They had no power to keep the populace on their guard against the ascendancy of royal majesty, the presence of their sovereigns, the involuntary terror which paralyzed their regicide arms, on hearing the voice of the august persons whose heroic firmness disarmed those monsters.

“In the alternative of consummating their crime by resuscitating the rage of the mob, or of reserving their tools for new atrocities, policy dictated to the chiefs the prudence of not unmasking themselves too plainly, of not taking upon themselves the exclusive responsibility of the last crime, and of not depriving themselves of the resource of transferring it to the aberration of the people.

“Since this time, the same perils continue impending over their Majesties: their existence is preserved only by dint of artifice and precarious expedients. Any day, France and Europe may have to assume mourning. Their Majesties count the moments until the publication of the manifesto. Their life is a prolonged agony.

“In the course of this month the factious assemble at Paris a new federation, their satellites. If external arrangements do not counterbalance the daring of their plots—if that courage which the King is resolved on displaying in case of a fatal extremity, is not seconded by the declaration of the powers and the promptitude of severe measures, we must turn our faces to the wall and submit to Providence.

“The assassination of their Majesties would be the signal for a general massacre. The links which still sustain society in France are dwindled to a thread; a fearful destruction overhangs the devoted country, and within five

weeks it may be reduced to a worse state than St. Domingo.

“What remedy would then be applicable to such a measure of calamity? The nature of the war, its aim, its effects, would be totally changed; but only to have displayed this picture executed with the honesty of strict truth, is enough to make us confide entirely in the humanity and wisdom of the courts of Vienna and Berlin.

“Presented to the King of Prussia on the 14th July, 1792, and on the following day to his imperial and royal Majesty, as well as to Count de Cobentzel, Vice-Chancellor of State, and Baron de Spielman, referendary in Chancery.”

III.

PAGE 371.

“Dumouriez lui fit parvenir par son aide-de-camp le colonel Thouvenot, des projets de contre-révolution.”

The Colonel's letter is as follows. In the original, the signature alone is in his handwriting.

LETTER FROM COLONEL THOUVENOT TO MALLET DU PAN.

“Lenze, June 12, 1793.

“Sir,

“On my return to Brussels I found General Dumouriez about to start for England. His love to his country is unaltered, and the means of saving it continue to absorb his thoughts. He is deeply affected at finding no sound views, so far as he has seen and heard, among the various parties of emigrants—none of whom listen to anything but projects

of vengeance, and are further and further from the probability of returning to their country and giving it a government. The most absolute despotism, the impossible recurrence to the state of things prior to 1788, the same form of the social body, are the least absurd bases of their incoherent projects. The death of so many Frenchmen, the dismemberment of France, its destruction as a preponderating power in Europe, the frightful fate impending over their relatives, who are yet in that unhappy country, the impossibility of their atrocious plans—nothing strikes them: their misfortunes have served rather even to sour their character instead of maturing it. Yet the horror they entertain of the atrocities perpetrated in France by the party diametrically opposed to them, ought surely to divest them of all idea of committing the like.

“General Dumouriez has not yet any settled plan of action. It was necessary for him, first of all, to know the temper of the emigrants and their resources, the projects of the foreign powers, the actual and probable course of their execution, and the state of their respective finances, the effects of his departure from the army, his proclamations, and of the equally foolish and barbarous conduct of the National Convention. In the facts he has just learned on these various points, he has been unable to found any hope of rescue for France,—to which object he means, nevertheless, to devote all his talents, resolved never to abandon it until he perceive his inability to contribute to it further.

“The Convention is said to be divided into two factions. The Maratists are installed at Paris; the Girondists at Versailles. You will feel all the consequences of this division, and how much we must regret that it is out of our

power to offer, at this very moment, on the French territory, a rational rallying point to that party in France which desires and needs a government. This party is very strong: it is the body, still robust and healthy, of the serpent whose head devours, and whose tail crushes us.

“ I shall leave in a fortnight for London. There I shall find General Dumouriez, who, engaged in writing, does not nevertheless overlook the means of action. His plan will be based :

“ 1st. On an alliance with the foreign powers.

“ 2nd. Essentially on the feelings of the French resulting from the revolution.

“ 3rd. On the actual state of France considered in its external and internal relations.

“ 4th. On the concurrence of all the royalists, whatever may be their secondary opinions relative to the monarchical form of government.

“ 5th. On the deliverance of the prisoners from the Temple.

“ 6th. On a general amnesty, to be scrupulously observed by all parties—the sole exception from which shall consist in the imprisonment of the great criminals and the chiefs of all the sanguinary parties, preliminary to their trial, so soon as government shall be able to uphold the course of justice.

“ 7th. On requiring that all the chiefs employed in so noble a cause should swear to inflict punishment on all the perpetrators of private vengeance, of arbitrary acts, and on such as should fail in observing the conditions of the amnesty.

“ The present disorder and confusion of the revolutionary authorities render prompt measures, great activity and

determination obligatory, in order to insure success in the cause we are anxious to promote.

“Should you approve of my ideas—should you induce those who are to co-operate in restoring social order in France, to approve of them—let us act in concert, and interpose our mediation to reunite two parties, apparently opposed to each other, but capable of entering into a desirable arrangement, when they become convinced that reason and common sense command the step.

“I remain with true esteem, &c.

“COLONEL THOUVENOT.”

IV.

It is owing to an obliging correspondent that we are able to insert two curious letters written at this period—between 1793 and 1794—by the Duke of Orleans (Louis-Philippe), and General Montesquiou.

At this time the Prince, destitute of resources, having taken refuge in Switzerland, was occupied in recovering considerable sums of money vested in England before the revolution. The difficulty of such an enterprise, at such a time, may be easily conceived. Montesquiou, the Prince's devoted friend, commended his interests to the Chevalier d'Ivernois, whose name has more than once occurred in these Memoirs. He could not have placed them in better hands.

D'Ivernois was born at Geneva in 1757; he had in early youth attached himself to the representative party, with all the warmth of an ardent and enthusiastic tempera-

ment, and his prudence and experience had been fostered into precocious maturity in the hot-bed of political strife. When, in 1792, General Montesquiou invaded Savoy and the surrounding country, d'Ivernois, by the weight of his personal influence, far more than by the powers with which he was invested, induced him to spare Geneva; and when, to punish this act of generosity, the Convention passed a degree of accusation against Montesquiou, d'Ivernois had the happiness to save his life. Informed by a singular accident of the arrival of a courier, bringing from Paris a warrant of arrest, at that period the certain prelude of death, he instantly sent warning to the General, then encamped on the left bank of the Rhone, and took measures for his escape; while the messenger, detained by his orders on the right bank, was wasting his time in parleying to obtain the opening of the town gates, which gave access to the only bridge the river afforded.

Soon afterwards, the name of d'Ivernois resounded in the first citations of the revolutionary tribunal, established at Geneva, where the bloody scenes of Paris were enacted over again. Fortunate enough to escape the ruffians who condemned him, and who in their savage fury had him executed in effigy, he passed over into England, where his talents soon placed him in a distinguished position. But the memory of his political conduct still lived in his native country; and on the day when Geneva was united to the French Republic, d'Ivernois, as the reader already knows, shared with Mallet du Pan and Du Roveray in the hitherto unexampled honour of seeing, in the first article of the treaty, a clause in which the rancour of the Directory declared him for ever unworthy of the rights of a French citizen. In

London he commenced, and during fifteen years sustained, by means of valuable publications, a brilliant resistance to Napoleon's government. He was connected with most of the influential men of this period; and we shall now see how he was requested, by Montesquiou, to direct the steps taken to forward the Prince's interests.

The General's letter is interesting, both as expressing generous sentiments, and as revealing a circumstance hitherto unknown in the relations of the Duke of Orleans with his father.

The Duke's letter proves that this Prince, at the age of twenty, already possessed that ease in managing affairs, and that penetration in comprehending them, which afterwards so remarkably distinguished King Louis Philippe the First.

LETTER FROM GENERAL MONTESQUIOU TO F. D'IVERNOS.

“ November 15, 1793.

“ I must consult you, my dear friend, on a matter interesting in itself, and which, in its results, may possibly prove both useful and important to us.

“ You know that the Duke of Orleans has just been condemned to death, by those whose accomplice he was thought to be. I despised him too much to regret him; but this event closely touches a young man whose acquaintance I have made by accident, and for whom I entertain a sincere regard. This young man is his eldest son. His virtues are as numerous as the vices of his father, whose vote for the King's death had produced a coldness between them. The youth, then, hearing that a

decree of accusation had been passed against him, even before the defection of Dumouriez, under whom he served, wisely determined on a retreat. He came to Switzerland, where Mme. de Sillery, unfortunately for him, arrived at the same time. The horror inspired by the name of his father, and the contempt universally felt for Mme. de Sillery, subjected the Duke of Chartres to many mortifications. Finding himself an object almost of persecution, he called upon me, and if I may be allowed such an expression, threw himself into my arms. For some time he inhabited my house, preserving a strict incognito; and at length, by the intervention of friends, I have succeeded in securing for him an asylum, where he lives unknown to all but myself. He had not a farthing; but I have lent him money, and indeed have felt much pleasure in doing him all the service in my power, for I never knew a more interesting young man. Now the Duke of Orleans is dead, and all his property confiscated. So far nothing can be done at present; but all his fortune was not in France. For the last ten years he had continually invested money in England, and it is thought that he possessed there a very considerable sum. Besides this, it is quite certain that all his diamonds were sent thither for safety. In short, I have reason to believe that what he secured here, amounts to at least ten or twelve millions. There can be no doubt that his eldest son, the only one of his sons now at liberty—the other two being in a French prison—has a right to claim this inheritance. But he knows neither its nature, its value, nor its depositaries. Circumstances do not admit of his proceeding to England himself. Could I go thither without inconvenience, I should have no hesi-

tation in rendering him so important a benefit. But my position no more allows of it than his does. I have thought that you might find me the man he wants. You will, of course, understand, that a service of such value would be most liberally recompensed. We need a person well acquainted with London, and enjoying access to the ministry, a person who understands business, and possesses the art of baffling rogues. Though I know Du Roveray only by reputation, I thought he might perhaps undertake this matter; but we should wish you to appoint a secondary agent, who might call upon me, take the information I could give him, receive powers of attorney, and then start for London, where he would place himself under the guidance of M. Du Roveray. Yet more is needful: he must have money enough to accomplish the journey at his own expense; for we have none; but we soon shall possess plenty, and he will be well paid.

“You will see that this is a pressing matter. I entreat you to consider it seriously, to reply without delay, and to strain every nerve to help me in this business, in one way or another, for I shall prefer your suggestions to my own. You would feel no less interest than myself, if, like me, you knew the person I am endeavouring to serve. I should, myself, have been very glad to perform the journey, but Germany alarms me, and I doubt whether I should be openly received in London. Without dwelling on this plan, which appears impracticable, I pass to the other, which seems easy; and I count on the advantage of your opinion. I shall await your answer with the greatest impatience.

“Adieu, my dear friend. For the last year you have

been my stronghold. I deserve that you should continue so, for no one can love you more affectionately than I do."

LETTER FROM THE DUKE OF ORLEANS (LOUIS PHILIPPE) TO
THE SAME.

"Coire, 27th January, 1784,

"Emboldened by a common friend, I venture, Sir, to take advantage of your sojourn in England, and ask of you services to which I have no personal claim.

"I know that our friend has written to you on the subject, that you have expressed interest in my misfortunes, and have thought them a sufficient call upon you for the sacrifice of some portion of your time. Deeply as I feel your kindness, the only return I can make for it is, entire confidence; and I shall think myself most happy if you will accept this testimony of my gratitude.

"I say nothing here of my manifold calamities—they are but too well known. They have reduced me, at twenty years of age, to the necessity of regarding myself as the father of a sister of sixteen, also an exile, and of two young brothers, now lying in prison under the hand of the executioners of all our family. The immense fortune we ought to have inherited in France, is all confiscated; and no resource is left us save the funds transferred by my father to foreign lands. I understood from himself that he possessed considerable sums in England; but he never furnished me with any details regarding the nature of his investments there, or the persons to whom he had entrusted the management of his property. The

only fact I know with certainty is, that he deposited in the hands of Mr. Boyd a large portion of his diamonds, a list of which has been sent you, and which my father assured me were wholly at his disposal or mine. Mr. Boyd will assuredly never dispute this deposit, the proofs of which are in my possession; but he may, perhaps, think he has a right to use it, to liquidate some debts due to him from my father. But I am not of this opinion: first, because a man of delicacy will always look upon a deposit as sacred; secondly, because Mr. Boyd has already urged his claims at Paris, and has even, in preference to other creditors, obtained payment of considerable sums on the property which has been sold; thirdly, because no man ought to pay himself; and whatever may be the nature of these demands, there are certain public forms to which they, like all others, should be subjected.

“I have forwarded to you the name of the lawyer my father employed in London, and those of the persons I know to be, or have been, well acquainted with his affairs there. One of his English possessions cannot have disappeared; the valuable furniture of a house he rented, No. 3, Chapel Street, near Park Lane; the porter was a person named Papy. If, as I think, my father had funds in the bank, there must be means of ascertaining the fact. These, Sir, are the principal matters for which I desire the aid of your information and your exertions.

“Accordingly, as you kindly allow it, I beg you to accept my most express authorization to make in my name all the necessary inquiries of all depositaries of goods or property belonging to my father, the late Duke

of Orleans, especially of Mr. Boyd, banker, with respect to the diamonds my father placed in his hands; and I engage immediately to transmit to you the most ample powers possible, according to the terms and forms required by the laws of England.

“This last sentence conveys what I have also addressed to you on a separate sheet of paper, for any general use you may wish to make of it; and the power is left blank, as you desire.

“Should the day ever come for me to prove to you my ardent gratitude, sincere esteem, and warm affection, that day, Sir, will be the happiest of my life.

“LOUIS PHILIPPE D'ORLEANS.”

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

DC
146
M25
A15
v.1

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.**

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 160 542 7

